This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

18 3

FEB 1 0 1914

Land.
ZMX

The English Theological Library

General Editor

Frederic Relton, A.K.C.

Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington

With General Introduction by

Mandell Creighton, D.D., D.C.L., etc.

Sometime Lord Bishop of London.

A RELATION OF THE

CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

WILLIAM LAUD

Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury

AND

MR. FISHER THE JESUIT

By the Command of KING JAMES
of ever Blessed Memory

With an Answer to such exceptions as
A. C. takes against it

By the said Most Reverend Father in God

WILLIAM
Lord Archbishop of Canterbury

A NEW EDITION WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES BY

C. H. SIMPKINSON, M.A., BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD
RECTOR OF STOKE-UPON-TRENT
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER
AUTHOR OF "LIFE AND TIMES OF WILLIAM LAUD"

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1901

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
251538
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1902 L

GLASGOW: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THEOLOGY is concerned with setting forth the truth of God as He has revealed it in His Word to His Church. This truth needs new application to the conditions and circumstances—intellectual and social—of each generation. As various problems arise in the world of man, various aspects of God's truth receive additional emphasis and explanation. Theology grows according to the growth of human knowledge. It brings out of the treasure-house of Scripture "things new and old."

A student of theology who wishes to gain accurate knowledge on any particular point, must refer to the time when that point was forced into prominence by some movement or tendency of thought. At such times men's minds, with the full force of their intelligence and their learning, were directed to the full investigation of a question which pressed for immediate solution. At such periods a subject was fully studied and thought out. It is only when we are in contact with minds to which these subjects were of vital importance that we feel their full significance.

Broad lines were laid down, after full discussion, and large principles emerged. These have become permanent possessions, and are even regarded as commonplaces. But we do not feel their force when we read them in a compendium. We only lay hold of ideas as we lend ourselves, in some degree, to the process by which they were acquired. It is for this reason that text-books can never be quite satisfactory. They need to be vitalized by some knowledge, however slight, of the original writers whose thoughts they summarise.

It is the object of the "English Theological Library" to select works of the chief English theologians which may serve to illustrate their methods, and represent the chief ideas which they enforced. It is inevitable that many of these works are of a controversial nature. It is scarcely too much to say that most men have become theologians in spite of themselves. They have read, and meditated, and taught, till some tendency of popular thought ran counter to their ideas. They were bound to face this fact, to penetrate more deeply into the foundations of their own belief, and then to state their results and give their reasons at every stage. They had to make good their own position against opponents who often owed their importance merely to the fact that they had a strong body of floating opinion behind them. One part—often an ungrateful part—of their work was to clear away partial conceptions which rested on no solid basis. They had to destroy before they could begin to build. Even in our own day we

have need to learn the temper and method in which a controversy may be conducted so as to substitute accurate thinking for vague opinions, or prejudices which have their root in the desire to maintain an existing system rather than to seek for the truth.

The "English Theological Library," as it advances, will not only put forth standard works of English theology, but will illustrate the history of the great crises of the English Church. In many cases it is difficult to select, among the voluminous writings of a theologian, a particular work which adequately expresses his ideas. But a collection of detached passages is dangerous, as it necessarily depends upon the opinion of him who makes the extracts, and reduces formulated results and *obiter dicta* to the same proportions. It is better to read one complete treatise than a number of quotations. It is only so that it is possible to gain a knowledge of the writer and of his method. In theology, above all other subjects, it is the intellectual temper of the writer which inspires confidence in his conclusions.

English theology is penetrated by the same spirit as distinguishes the English character in other branches of literature. It is strong in sound and massive learning, and has never had reason to separate itself from other departments of English thought. It has no style of its own, and is not expressed in technical language, nor clothed in special phraseology. Its great products rank among the noblest specimens of English prose,

and its literary merits are of a very high order. It may be read by readers of every class. Doubtless the forms of appeal to the popular consciousness vary in every age, and methods which once were powerful soon grow antiquated. But pulpit oratory, after all, lasts longer than other forms of oratory, and the roll of English preachers has produced finer examples of eloquence than exist elsewhere.

The strenuous pursuit of truth, sobriety, high thoughts, commanding power of expression—these are great qualities. They are all to be found in the books which are to be issued in this series. Introductions and notes will serve to bridge over the gulf which must always to some degree separate the thought of the past from the thought of the present. It is better to read one great book than a series of little books. It is better to seek for the truth where its issues were most seriously felt, than to rest content with tabulated arguments in its favour. Theological students will profit by contact with great minds. It is for their guidance especially that this series is designed. They would gain in power to face the problems of our own time if they were better acquainted with the great heritage of the past, and were animated by the same spirit as their predecessors, whose lot was cast in no less difficult days.

M. LONDON.

EDITOR'S PREFACE

LAUD's Conference with Fisher took place on May 24, 1622. At that time there was no intention that any account of it should be published. The first edition was published by Laud in the name of one of his chaplains in 1624. In 1639 he brought out a Book which, though based on the publication of 1624, was really a restatement of the whole question at much greater length. This contained his ripe judgment on the controversy between Rome and England. A second edition was published in the same year. A new (third) edition appeared in 1673 with corrections probably by Dr. Bayly, his executor, who, it is understood, used notes prepared by Laud during his imprisonment. It was again republished in 1686; and again in 1839 and in 1849, this last time as a part of a complete edition of Laud's Works. To the learned editor of 1849, Mr. Scott, the present edition owes much. In order to make the Book more useful to the general Reader, it has been divided by the present Editor into chapters, to each of which a summary is prefixed; and a much fuller index has been prepared.

A great number of historical notes have been added; and in many cases the quotations made by the Archbishop have been largely amplified, while a translation has been appended to all the passages quoted. References are often given to more than one edition of the Fathers in order to make it easier to the scholar to verify important references.

In a few places the argument has been supported by the insertion, at the end of chapters, of passages taken from the works of men of Laud's School, and now and then from an older English Churchman.

All additions to Laud's own work are placed in square brackets [ ].

CONTENTS

PAGE

General Introduction to the Series, by Bishop Creighton, v

Preface to Laud's Controversy with Fisher, by C. H. Simpkinson, - - - - - - - - - - - - ix

Bibliography of "The Conference with Fisher," - - xv

Archbishop Laud's Epistle Dedicatory to the King, - - xvii
Note on the Epistle, - - - - - - - - xxxi

Historical Introduction, by C. H. Simpkinson, - - - xxxii

CHAPTER I.

The Infallible Church, - - - - - - - - - - - 3

CHAPTER II.

What are the Fundamentals of the Faith? - - - - - - 31
Introductory Note on Laud's Defence of the Eastern Church, 31
Note from Stillingfleet's *Vindication of Laud*, - - - 59

CHAPTER III.

The Church of England rests on the infallible Rock of Holy Scripture, 60
Introductory Note on Laud's treatment of the argument, - 60

CHAPTER IV.

The office of the Church is to guide men to the Scriptures, - - 93
Introductory Note on the proofs for the Divine authority of Scripture, - - - - - - - - - - - 93
Note on the Roman Church in 1622 and to-day, - - - 118

PAGE

CHAPTER V.

Proofs that Scripture is the Word of God, - - - - - - 119

CHAPTER VI.

In debates among Christians, the authority of Scripture must be assumed and granted on both sides, - - - - - - - 133

CHAPTER VII.

The Church of Rome is not "the True Church"; and is not a "right Church," - - - - - - - - - - - - - 144

Introductory Note on "Was the Roman Church the right Church before Luther?" - - - - - - - 144

Note from Stillingfleet's *Vindication of Laud*, - - - 176

CHAPTER VIII.

Who is to be the Judge? The Claims of Rome, - - - - 181

CHAPTER IX.

The Authority of General Councils, - - - - - - - - 220

Note A. Laud's Answer to Lord Say's Speech touching the Liturgy, - - - - - - - - - - - 254

Note B. Extracts from Bishop Jewell:

Account of Council of Trent under Julius III., - - 256

Council of Trent under Pius IV., - - - - - 256

Julius III.'s Bull, - - - - - - - - 257

CHAPTER X.

The Possibility of Error in a General Council, - - - - - 258

CHAPTER XI.

The Pope is not Infallible, - - - - - - - - - 304

Notes on "Intention," - - - - - - - - 328

A. Chillingworth, - - - - - - - - 328

B. Bramhall, - - - - - - - - - 329

CHAPTER XII.

Can a Romanist be saved? - - - - - - - - - 331

Note on Laud's Eucharistic Teaching, - - - - - 367

PAGE

CHAPTER XIII.

The Roman Church an uncertain Refuge; while the English Church offers Security, - - - - - - - - - - - - 368

CHAPTER XIV.

A direct question: Can I be saved in the Roman Church? Can I be saved in the English Church? - - - - - - - - 378

CHAPTER XV.

Effect of the Conference on the Countess—Conclusion, - - - - 434

Note on the Effect of the Conference, - - - - - 451

Note from Laud's Answer at his Trial, - - - - - 451

A TABLE OF THE PLACES OF SCRIPTURE QUOTED IN THE CONFERENCE, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 453

INDEX, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 457

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF "THE CONFERENCE WITH FISHER."

1624.

A replie to Jesuit Fisher's Answere to certain questions propounded by his most gracious Majestie, King James. By Francis White, D: of Div. Deane of Carlile. . . . Hereunto is annexed a [Third] Conference of the right: R: B. of St. Dauid's [Laud] with the same Jesuit. . . .

Folio. London, Adam Islip, 1624.

ll 164, pp. 592 + Index ll 2. Then follows, with a new title page and paging, "An Answer to Mr. Fisher's Relation of a Third Conference between a certain B. (as he stiles him) and himselfe, which is here given by R. B[aylie] Chapleine to the B. that was employed in the Conference. London, 1624."

ll 2 + pp. 74.

The work is really by Laud himself.

Cf. Laud's *Diary*, Ap. 16, 1624. "My conference with Fisher, the Jesuit, printed, came forth."

According to Lowndes a new edition was published in 1637; but this does not appear to be the case.

1639.

A Relation of the Conference Betweene William Lawd, Then, Lord Bishop of St. David's; Now, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbvry: And Mr. Fisher the Jesuite. . . . With an Answer to such Exceptions as A. C. takes against it. By the sayd Most Reverend Father in GOD, William, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury.

Folio. London. Printed by Richard Badger, Printer to the Prince His Highness. MDCXXXIX.

ll 12 + pp. 388. Some copies of this edition contain the "Table annexed" mentioned below. Those without it are not imperfect, as one such was a presentation copy from the Archbishop.

Mr. Scott, who had not seen the rare Second Edition, considered this to be the Second Edition, and counted the latter part of "The Replie," etc., above as the first. [Laud's *Works*, ii., p. xxiv. ff.]

1639.

[The Same.] The Second Edition Revised; with a Table annexed.

Folio. London, Printed by Richard Badger, Printer to the Prince His Highness. MDCXXXIX.

ll 12 + pp. 388 + ll 8. Bodl. Lib. G. 7. 13. Th.

1673.
[The Same.] The Third Edition revised.
Folio. London: J. C. for Tho. Basset, etc. 1673.

ll 12 + pp. 253 + ll 7. Probably revised for the press by Dr. Richard Baylie (or Baily), Laud's Chaplain, who died Dean of Salisbury in 1667.

1686.
[The Same.] The Fourth Edition. . . .
Folio. London: Ralph Holt for Thomas Bassett and two others. 1686.

ll 7 + pp. 253 + ll 6.

1839.
[The Same.] The Fifth Edition [edited by Dr. Cardwell].
8vo. Oxford, 1839.

pp. xxxii. + 336.

1847.
The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D., sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. 7 vols. [Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.] 8vo. Oxford: John Henry Parker. MDCCCXLVII., etc.

Vol. ii., 1849. pp. [xxxi.] + xl. + 440. Conference with Fisher.

For Answers and Rejoinders to Laud's Book see *Archbishop Laud Commemoration*, 1895. Edited by Prof. W. E. Collins, All Hallows Barking, E.C.

To this Book we are indebted for this Bibliography.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD'S EPISTLE DEDICATORY TO THE KING.

TO

HIS MOST SACRED MAJESTY,

CHARLES,

BY THE GRACE OF GOD,

KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, ETC.

DREAD SOVEREIGN,

THIS tract will need patronage, as great as may be had, that's yours. Yet, when I first printed part of it, I presumed not to ask any, but thrust it out at the end of another's labours, that it might seem, at least, to have the same patron, your royal Father of blessed memory, as the other work, on which this attended, had.[1] But now I humbly beg for it your Majesty's patronage; and leave withal, that I may declare to your most excellent Majesty, the cause why this tract was then written: why it stayed so long before it looked upon the light: why it was not then thought fit to go alone, but rather be led abroad by the former work: why it comes now forth both with alteration and addition: and why this addition made not more haste to the press than it hath done.

[1] [Laud's first account of his "*Conference with Fisher the Jesuit*," published under the name of his Chaplain, Dr. Baylie, appeared under the title, "*An Answere to Mr. Fisher's Relation of a Third Conference betweene a certain ℣. (as he stiles him) and himselfe. The Conference was very private, till Mr. Fisher spread certaine Papers of it, which in many respects deserved an answere. Which is here given by R. B. Chapleine to the ℣. that was imployed in the Conference.*" London, printed by Adam Islip, 1624." It is appended to Dr. Francis White's *Replie to Jesuit Fisher's answere*, etc. (*Vide infra*, p. 1. note 2). White's book is dedicated to King James, to whom he was Chaplain.]

The cause why this discourse was written, was this: I was, at the time of these Conferences with Master Fisher, Bishop of St. David's; and not only directed, but commanded, by my blessed master, King James, to this Conference with him. He, when we met,[2] began with a great protestation of seeking the truth only, and that for itself. And certainly, truth, especially in religion, is so to be sought, or not to be found. He that seeks it with a Roman bias, or any other,[3] will run counter when he comes near it, and not find it, though he come within kenning of it. And therefore I did most heartily wish, I could have found the Jesuit upon that fair way he protested to go. After the Conference ended, I went, whither my duty called me, to my diocese; not suspecting anything should be made public, that was both commanded and acted in private. For W. I., the publisher of the Relation of the First Conference with Dr. White, the late reverend and learned Bishop of Ely, confesses plainly: "That Master Fisher was straitly charged upon his allegiance, from his Majesty that then was, not to set out, or publish what passed in some of these Conferences, till he gave licence, and until Mr. Fisher and they might meet, and agree, and confirm under their hands, what was said on both sides."[4] He says farther, "That Mr. Fisher went to Dr. White's house, to know what he would say about the Relation, which he had set out."[5] So then, belike Mr. Fisher had set out the Relation of that Conference before he went to Dr. White to speak about it. And this notwithstanding the King's restraint upon him, upon his allegiance. Yet to Dr. White it is said he went, but to what other end than to put a scorn upon him, I cannot see. For he went to his house to know "what he would say about that Relation of the Conference, which he had set out before." In my absence from London, Mr. Fisher used me as well. For with the same care of his allegiance, and no more, "He spread abroad papers of this Conference, full enough of partiality to his cause, and more full of calumny against me."[6]

[2] May 24, 1622.

[3] One of these biases, is an aversion from all such truth as fits not our ends. And a luce veritatis aversus, [et] ob hoc luci veritatis adversus (fit), etc.—[Being averse from the light of truth, he becomes for this reason adverse also to the light of truth.]—S. Augustin. *cont. Adversarium Legis et Prophet.* lib. ii. [cap. 7. *Op.*, tom. viii. col. 593. D.] And it is an easy transition, for a man that is averse from, to become adverse to, the truth.

[4] In his Epistle to the reader.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] These words were in my former epistle, [*i.e.* in the short Epistle to the Reader, prefixed to Laud's first account of the Conference published under the name of R. B.] and A. C. checks at them, in defence of the Jesuit, and says: "That the Jesuit did

Hereupon I was in a manner forced to give Mr. Fisher's Relation of the Conference, an answer, and to publish it. Though for some reasons, and those then approved by authority, it was thought fit I should set it out in my chaplain's name, R. B., and not in my own. To which I readily submitted.

There was a cause also, why at the first, the Discourse upon this Conference stayed so long, before it could endure to be pressed. For the Conference was in May, 1622.[7] And Mr. Fisher's paper was scattered and made common, so common, that a copy was brought to me, being none of his special friends, before Michaelmas. And yet this Discourse was not printed till April, 1624. Now that you may know how this happened, I shall say for myself, It was not my idleness, nor my unwillingness to right both myself and the cause, against the Jesuit, and the paper which he had spread, that occasioned this delay. For I had then most honourable witnesses, and have some yet living, that this Discourse, such as it was when A. C. nibbled at it, was finished long before I could persuade myself to let it come into public view. And this was caused partly by my own backwardness to deal with these men, whom I have ever observed to be great pretenders for truth and unity, but yet such as will admit neither, unless they and their faction may prevail in all; as if no reformation had been necessary. And partly because there were about the same

not at all, so much as in speech, and much less in papers, publish this or either of the other two Conferences [which he had] with Dr. White, until he was forced unto it by false reports, given out [about them] to his private disgrace and the prejudice of the Catholic cause. Nor then did he spread papers abroad, but only delivered a very few copies to special friends, and this not with intent to calumniate the Bishop, etc."—A. C. in his preface before his "*Relation of this Conference* [*between a certain* B. *and Mr. Fisher, defended against the said* B.*'s Chaplain.*" A. C. p. 37.] Truly, I knew of no reports then given out to the prejudice of the Jesuit's either person or cause. I was in a corner of the kingdom, where I heard little. But howsoever, here is a most plain confession by A. C. of that which he struggles to deny. He says, "He did not spread papers." What then? What? why "he did but deliver copies." Why, but doth not he that delivers copies, for instance, of a libel, spread it? Yea, "but he delivered but a very few copies."—[*ibid.* p. 38.] Be it so; I do not say how many he spread. He confesses the Jesuit delivered some, though very few; and he that delivers any, spreads it abroad. For what can he tell, when the copies are once out of his power, how many may copy them out, and spread them farther? Yea, "but he delivered them to special friends." —[*ibid.* p. 38.] Be it so too: the more special friends they were to him, the less indifferent would they be to me, perhaps my more special enemies. Yea, but all this was "without an intent to calumniate me."—[*ibid.* p. 38.] Well, be that so too. But if I be calumniated thereby, his intention will not help it. And whether the copies, which he delivered, have not in them calumny against me, I leave to the indifferent reader of this Discourse to judge.

[7] [*Vide supra*, note 2.]

time, three Conferences held with Fisher. Of these this was the third; and could not therefore conveniently come abroad into the world, till the two former were ready to lead the way, which till that time they were not.

And this is in part the reason also, why this tract crept into the end of a larger work. For since that work contained in a manner the substance of all that passed in the two former Conferences, and that this third, in divers points, concurred with them and depended on them, I could not think it substantive enough to stand alone. But besides this affinity between the Conferences, I was willing to have it pass as silently as it might, at the end of another work, and so perhaps little to be looked after, because I could not hold it worthy, nor can I yet, of that great duty and service which I owe to my dear mother the Church of England.

There is a cause also, why it looks now abroad again with alteration and addition. And it is fit I should give your Majesty an account of that too. This tract was first printed in the year 1624. And in the year 1626, another Jesuit, or the same, under the name of A. C., printed a Relation of this Conference, and therein took exceptions to some particulars, and endeavoured to confute some things delivered therein by me. Now being in years, and unwilling to die in the Jesuit's debt, I have in this Second Edition done as much for him, and somewhat more. For he did but skip up and down, and labour to pick a hole here and there, where he thought he might fasten; and where it was too hard for him, let it alone. But I have gone thorough with him; and, I hope, given him a full confutation; or at least such a bone to gnaw, as may shake his teeth, if he look not to it. And of my addition to this Discourse, this is the cause; but of my alteration of some things in it, this. A. C. his curiosity to winnow me, made me in a more curious manner fall to sifting of myself, and that which had formerly passed my pen. And though (I bless God for it,) I found no cause to alter anything that belonged either to the substance or course of the Conference: yet somewhat I did find which needed better and clearer expression, and that I have altered, well knowing I must expect curious observers on all hands.

Now, why this additional answer to the relation of A. C. came no sooner forth, hath a cause too, and I shall truly represent it. A. C.'s relation of the Conference was set out, 1626. I knew not

of it in some years after; for it was printed among divers other things of like nature, either by Mr. Fisher himself, or his friend A. C. When I saw it, I read it over carefully, and found myself not a little wronged in it; but the Church of England, and indeed the cause of religion, much more. I was before this time, by your Majesty's great grace and undeserved favour, made Dean of your Majesty's Chapel Royal, and a Councillor of State; and hereby, as the occasions of those times were, made too much a stranger to my books. Yet for all my busy employments, it was still in my thoughts to give A. C. an answer. But then I fell into a most dangerous fever; and though it pleased God, beyond all hope, to restore me to health, yet long I was before I recovered such strength, as might enable me to undertake such a service.[8] And since that time, how I have been detained, and in a manner forced upon other many, various, and great occasions, your Majesty knows best. And how of late I have been used by the scandalous and scurrilous pens of some bitter men, (whom I heartily beseech God to forgive,) the world knows; little leisure and less encouragement given me to answer a Jesuit, or set upon other services, while I am under the prophet's affliction; between the "mouth that speaks wickedness, and the tongue that sets forth deceit, and slander me as thick, as if I were not their own mother's son."[9] In the midst of these libellous outcries against me, some divines of great note and worth in the Church, came to me one by one, and no one knowing of the other's coming, (as to me they protested,) and persuaded with me to reprint this Conference in my own name. This they thought would vindicate my reputation, were it generally known to be mine. I confess, I looked round about these men and their motion; and at last, my thoughts working much upon themselves, I began to persuade myself that I had been too long diverted from this necessary work; and that perhaps there might be *in voce hominum, tuba Dei*, "in the still voice of men, the loud trumpet of

Ps. l. 19, 20.

[8] [Laud was sworn in Dean of the Chapel Royal, Octob. 16, 1626, and Privy Councillor, April 29, 1627. The illness to which Laud alludes, is mentioned in his Diary, 1629. "Aug. 14. I fell sick upon the way towards the Court, at Woodstock; I took up my lodging at my ancient friend's house, Mr. Francis Windebank. There I lay in a most grievous burning fever, till Monday, Sept. 7, on which day I had my last fit. I was brought so low, that I was not able to return towards my own house at London, till Tuesday, Octob. 29."]

[9] [This passage refers to the libels of Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne, who were censured in the Star-Chamber, June 14, 1637.]

God," which sounds many ways, sometimes to the ears, and sometimes to the hearts of men, and by means which they think not of. And as St. Augustine speaks, "A word of God there is, *quod nunquam tacet, sed non semper auditur*, 'which though it be never silent, yet is not always heard.'"[10] That it is never silent, is His great mercy; and that it is not always heard, is not the least of our misery. Upon this motion I took time to deliberate, and had scarce time for that, much less for the work; yet at last, to every of these men I gave this answer: That Mr. Fisher, or A. C. for him, had been busy with my former Discourse and that I would never reprint that, unless I might gain time enough to answer that which A. C. had charged afresh both upon me and the cause. While my thoughts were thus at work, your Majesty fell upon the same thing, and was graciously pleased not to command, but to wish, me to reprint this Conference, and in mine own name; and this openly, at the Council-table, in Michaelmas Term, 1637.[11] I did not hold it fit to deny, having in all the course of my service obeyed your Majesty's honourable and just motions as commands; but craved leave to show, what little leisure I had to do it, and what inconveniences might attend upon it. When this did not serve to excuse me, I humbly submitted to that, which I hope was God's motion in your Majesty's. And having thus laid all that concerns this Discourse, before your gracious and most sacred Majesty, I most humbly present you with the book itself; which as I heartily pray you

[10] [Sed quid mirum? Verbum Dei nunquam tacet; sed non semper auditur. Yet what wonder? The Word of God is never silent: but He is not always heard.]—S. Augustin. *Serm.* [*li. de concord. Matth. et Luc.* olim *Serm.*] lxiii. *de diversis*, cap. 10. [*Op.*, tom. v. col. 291. C.] He speaks of Christ, disputing in the temple with the elders of the Jews. And they heard Christ, the essential Word of the Father, with admiration to astonishment, yet believed Him not. St. Luke ii. 47. And the Word then spake to them, by a means they thought not of, namely, *per Filium Dei in puero*, "by the Son of God Himself, under the veil of our human nature."

[11] [It seems not improbable, that King Charles might have made this request on the occasion which is thus alluded to by Laud in his Diary: "1637. Octob. 22, Sunday.—A great noise about the perverting of the Lady Newport. Speech of it at the Council. My free speech there to the King, concerning the increase of the Roman party, the freedom at Durham House, the carriage of Mr. Walter Montague and Sir Toby Matthews. The Queen acquainted with all I said, that very night, and highly displeased with me, and so continues." This Lady Newport (Heylyn's *Life of Laud*, p. 337.) was "a kinswoman of the Duke of Buckingham"; the Queen's chapel was at Somerset (then called Durham) House; and Montague, a son of the Earl of Manchester, and Matthews, eldest son of the Archbishop of York, were two of the most distinguished persons who had conformed to the Church of Rome.]

to protect, so do I wholly submit it to the Church of England, with my prayers for her prosperity, and my wishes that I were able to do her better service.

I have thus acquainted your Majesty with all occasions which both formerly and now again have led this Tract into the light; in all which I am a faithful relater of all passages, but am not very well satisfied who is now my adversary. Mr. Fisher was at the Conference. Since that I find A. C. at the print: and whether these be two or but one Jesuit, I know not, since scarce one amongst them goes under one name. But for my own part, and the error is not great, if I mistake, I think they are one, and that one, Mr. Fisher. That which induces me to think so is, first, the great inwardness of A. C. with Mr. Fisher, which is so great as may well be thought to neighbour upon identity. Secondly, the style of A. C. is so like Mr. Fisher's that I doubt it was but one and the same hand that moved the pen. Thirdly, A. C. says expressly, "That the Jesuit himself made the Relation of the first Conference with Dr. White": and in the title-page of the work that Relation as well as this is said to be made by A. C. and published by W. I. Therefore A. C. and the Jesuit are one and the same person, or else one of these places hath no truth in it. A. C. p. 67.

Now, if it be Mr. Fisher himself, under the name of A. C., then what needs these words: "The Jesuit could be content to let pass the Chaplain's censure as one of his ordinary persecutions for the Catholic faith, but A. C. thought it necessary for the common cause to defend the sincerity and truth of his relation, and the truth of some of the chief heads contained in it"?[12] In which speech, give me leave to observe to your sacred Majesty how grievously you suffer him and his fellows to be persecuted for the Catholic faith, when your poor subject and servant cannot set out a true copy of a Conference held with the Jesuit, *jussu superiorum*, but by and by the man is "persecuted." God forbid I should ever offer to persuade a persecution in any kind, or practise it in the least: for, to my remembrance, I have not given him or his so much as coarse language. But, on the other side, God forbid, too, that your Majesty should let both laws and discipline sleep for fear of the name of persecution; and, in the meantime, let Mr. Fisher and his fellows angle in all parts of your dominions for

[12] Preface to the *Relation of this Conference* by A. C.

your subjects. If in your grace and goodness you will spare their persons, yet I humbly beseech you see to it, that they be not suffered to lay either their wheels, or bait their hooks, or cast their nets in every stream, lest that tentation grow both too general and too strong. I know they have many devices to work their ends; but if they will needs be fishing, let them use none but lawful nets.[13] Let us have no dissolving of oaths of allegiance; no deposing, no killing of kings; no blowing up of states to settle *quod volumus*, that which fain they would have in the Church; with many other nets as dangerous as these; for if their profession of religion were as good as they pretend it is, if they cannot compass it by good means I am sure they ought
Rom. iii. 8. not to attempt it by bad; for, if they will "do evil that good may come thereof," the Apostle tells me "their damnation is just."

Now, as I would humbly beseech your Majesty to keep a serious watch upon these fishermen, which pretend St. Peter, but fish not with his net; so would I not have you neglect another sort of anglers in a shallower water; for they have some ill nets too; and if they may spread them when and where they will, God knows what may become of it. These have not so strong a back abroad as the Romanists have, but that is no argument to suffer them to increase. They may grow to equal strength with number; and factious people at home, of what sect or fond opinion soever they be, are not to be neglected, partly because they are so near—and it is ever a dangerous fire that begins in the bed-straw—and partly because all those domestic evils which threaten a rent in Church or State, are with far more safety prevented by wisdom than punished by justice. And would men consider it right, they are far more beholding to that man that keeps them from falling than to him that takes them up, though it be to set the arm or the leg that is broken in the fall.

In this Discourse I have no aim to displease any, nor any hope to please all. If I can help on to truth in the Church, and the peace of the Church together, I shall be glad, be it in any measure. Nor shall I spare to speak necessary truth out of too much love of peace; nor thrust on unnecessary truth to the

[13] [And St. Augustine is very full against the use of *mala retia*, "unlawful nets"; and saith the fishermen themselves have greatest cause to take heed of them.]—S. Augustin. *lib. de Fide et Operibus*, cap. xvii. [*Op.*, tom. vi. col. 183. F.]

breach of that peace which once broken is not so easily soldered again. And if for necessary truth's sake only, any man will be offended, nay take, nay snatch at that offence which is not given, I know no fence for that. It is truth, and I must tell it: it is the Gospel, and I must preach it. And far safer it is in this case 1 Co
to bear anger from men than a "woe" from God. And where the foundations of faith are shaken, be it by superstition or profaneness, he that puts not to his hand, as firmly as he can, to support them, is too wary, and hath more care of himself than of the cause of Christ; and it is a wariness that brings more danger in the end than it shuns; for the Angel of the Lord issued out a curse against "the inhabitants of Meroz, because they came not Jud
to help the Lord, to help the Lord against the mighty." I know it is a great ease to let everything be as it will, and every man believe and do as he list; but whether governors in State or Church do their duty therewhile, is easily seen, since this is an effect of "no king in Israel." Jud

The Church of Christ upon earth may be compared to a hive of bees, and that can be nowhere so steadily placed in this world but it will be in some danger; and men that care neither for the hive nor the bees have yet a great mind to the honey; and having once tasted the sweet of the Church's maintenance, swallow that for honey which one day will be more bitter than gall in their bowels. Now, the King and the Priest, more than any other, are bound to look to the integrity of the Church in doctrine and manners, and that in the first place; for that is by far the best honey in the hive. But, in the second place, they must be careful of the Church's maintenance too, else the bees shall make honey for others, and have none left for their own necessary sustenance, and then all is lost; for we see it in daily and common use, that the honey is not taken from the bees, but they are destroyed first. Now, in this great and busy work, the King and the Priest must not fear to put their hands to the hive, though they are sure to be stung; and stung by the bees whose hive and house they preserve. It was King David's case, God grant it be never yours. "They Ps.
came about me," saith the Psalm, "like bees."[14] This was hard usage enough, yet some profit, some honey, might thus be gotten

[14] Apum [vero] similitudine vesanum ardorem notat: [quia etsi] in illis [animalibus] non tantum est roboris, mira tamen [est] excandescentia.—[Under the figure of Bees he depicts a mad fire, because, though these creatures have very little strength, they are marvellously passionate.]—Calvin. in *Psalm* cxviii. [12 *Op.*, tom. iii. p. 434. col. 2.]

in the end. And that is the King's case. But when it comes to the Priest, the case is altered; they come about him like wasps, or like hornets rather—all sting and no honey there;—and all this many times for no offence, nay, sometimes for service done
Rev. xxii. 12. them, would they see it. But you know Who said, "Behold I come shortly, and My reward is with Me, to give to every man according as his works shall be." And He Himself is so
Gen.. xv. 1. "exceeding great a reward," as that the manifold stings which are in the world, howsoever they smart here, are nothing when they
Rom. viii 18. are pressed out with that "exceeding weight of glory" which shall be revealed.

Now, one thing more let me be bold to observe to your Majesty in particular, concerning your great charge, the Church of England. It is in a hard condition. She professes the ancient Catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her of novelty in her doctrine; she practices Church government as it hath been in use in all ages and all places where the Church of Christ hath taken any rooting, both in and ever since the Apostles' times, and yet the Separatist condemns her for Antichristianism in her discipline. The plain truth is, she is between these two factions, as between two millstones, and unless your Majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable both dishonour and loss to this kingdom. And it is very remarkable that while both these press hard upon the Church of England, both of them cry out upon "persecution"; like froward children, which scratch and kick and bite, and yet cry out all the while, as if themselves were killed. Now, to the Romanist I shall say this:—The errors of the Church of Rome are grown now, many of them, very old; and when errors are grown by age and continuance to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be far older, are ordinarily challenged for the bringers in of "new opinions." And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom than that the reformation of an old corrupted Church, will we nill we, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs: "Where was your Church before Luther"? for it was just there, where theirs is now. One and the same Church still, no doubt of that; one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity: their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same

Church under reformation.[15] The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still; but leprous with them, and cleansed with us;—the same man still. And for the Separatist, and him that lays his grounds for separation or change of discipline, though all he says, or can say, be in truth of divinity, and among learned men, little better than ridiculous, yet since these "fond opinions" have gained some ground among your people, to such among them as are wilfully set to "follow their blind guides" through thick and thin, till "they fall into the ditch together," I shall say nothing. But for so many of them as mean well, and are only misled by artifice and cunning; concerning them I shall say this much only:—They are bells of passing good metal, and tuneable enough of themselves and in their own disposition; and a world of pity it is that they are rung so miserably out of tune as they are, by them which have gotten power in and over their consciences.

Matt. xv. 14.

[15] "There is no other difference between us and Rome than betwixt a Church miserably corrupted, and happily purged," etc.—Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter, in his "Apologetical Advertisement to the Reader," [appended to *The Old Religion*, etc. the Third Edition,] p. 192. [194. ed. London, 1630.] approved by Thomas Morton, Bishop then of Coventry and Lichfield, now of Duresme, in the Letters printed by [Hall,] the Bishop of Exeter, in his Treatise called, *The Reconciler*, [*i.e.* "An Epistle pacificatory of the seeming differences of opinion concerning the trueness and visibility of the Roman Church:"] p. 68. [ed. London, 1629. Bishop Morton's words are: "And now remembering the accordance your Lordship hath with others touching the argument of your book, I must needs reflect upon myself; who have long since defended the same point, in the defence of many others."]—And Dr. Field, *Of the Church*, Appendix to the Third Part, chap. ii. [p. 880], where he cites Calvin to the same purpose; (*Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 2. § 11.) [. . . "I will first show that all our best and most renowned divines did ever acknowledge as much as I have written. 2. That the Roman Church is not the same now as it was when Luther began. And, 3. That we have not departed from the Church wherein our fathers lived and died, but only from the faction that was in it. Touching the first, M. Luther confesseth (*lib. contr. Anabapt. ubi infra*, p. 332. note 2,) that much good, nay, that all good, and the very marrow and kernel of faith, piety, and Christian belief was, by the happy providence of God, preserved even in the midst of all the confusions of the papacy. Mr. Calvin in like sort showeth that the true Church remained under the papacy: Cum Dominus fœdus Suum, saith he, in Gallia, Italia, Germania, Hispania et Anglia deposuerit; ubi illæ provinciæ Antichristi tyrannide oppressæ sunt, quo tamen fœdus Suum inviolabile maneret, Baptismum primo illic conservavit, fœderis testimonium, qui Ejus ore consecratus, invita humana impietate, vim suam retinet. Deinde Sua providentia effecit, ut aliae quoque reliquiæ exstarent, ne Ecclesia prorsus interiret; etc.—The Lord set His Covenant in France, Italy, Germany, Spain and England. These countries were oppressed by the tyranny of Antichrist. But the Lord took care to keep His Covenant safe. First He kept Baptism there, and this, the proof of the Covenant, made holy by His words, spite of human impiety, kept its force. Next, He providentially arranged that other Remains of His Religion should survive, so that the Church should not become quite dead.—Calvin. *Op.*, tom. viii. p. 281. col. 1.]

And for this there is yet remedy enough; but how long there will be, I know not.

Much talking there is—bragging, your Majesty may call it—on both sides; and when they are in their ruff they both exceed all moderation and truth too,—so far till both lips and pens open for all the world like a purse without money; nothing comes out of this, and that which is worth nothing out of them. And yet this nothing is made so great, as if the salvation of souls—that great work of the Redeemer of the world, the Son of God—could not be effected without it. And while the one faction cries up the Church above the Scripture, and the other the Scripture to the neglect and contempt of the Church, which the Scripture itself teaches men both to honour and obey; they have so far endangered the belief of the one, and the authority of the other, as that neither hath its due from a great part of men; whereas, according to Christ's institution, the Scripture, where it is plain, should guide the Church; and the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture; yet so, as neither the Scripture should be forced, nor the Church so bound up, as that upon just and farther evidence she may not revise that which in any case hath slipped by her. What success this great distemper, caused by the collision of two such factions, may have, I know not, I cannot prophesy. This I know, that the use which wise men should make of other men's falls, is not to fall with them; and the use which pious and religious men should make of these great flaws in Christianity, is not to join with them that make them, nor to help to dislocate those main bones in the body which being once put out of joint will not easily be set again. And though I cannot prophesy, yet I fear that atheism and irreligion gather strength while the truth is thus weakened by an unworthy way of contending for it. And while they thus contend, neither part consider that they are in a way to induce upon themselves and others that contrary extreme which they seem most both to fear and oppose.

Besides, this I have ever observed, that many rigid professors have turned Roman Catholics, and in that turn have been more Jesuited than any other: and such Romanists as have changed from them have for the most part quite leaped over the mean, and been as rigid the other way as extremity itself. And this, if there be not both grace and wisdom to govern it, is a very natural motion: for a man is apt to think he can never run far enough

from that which he once begins to hate, and does not consider therewhile, that where religion corrupted is the thing he hates, a fallacy may easily be put upon him; for he ought to hate the corruption which depraves religion, and to run from it; but from no part of religion itself, which he ought to love and reverence, ought he to depart. And this I have observed farther, that no one thing hath made conscientious men more wavering in their own minds, or more apt and easy to be drawn aside from the sincerity of religion professed in the Church of England, than the want of uniform and decent order in too many churches of the kingdom; and the Romanists have been apt to say, The houses of God could not be suffered to lie so nastily, as in some places they have done, were the true worship of God observed in them, or did the people think that such it were. It is true, the inward worship of the heart is the great service of God, and no service acceptable without it; but the external worship of God in His Church is the great witness to the world, that our heart stands right in that service of God. Take this away, or bring it into contempt, and what light is there left "to shine before men, that they may see our devotion, and glorify our Father which is in heaven"? And to deal clearly with your Majesty, these thoughts are they, and no other, which have made me labour so much as I have done for decency and an orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the Church; for of that which is inward there can be no witness among men, nor no example for men. Now, no external action in the world can be uniform without some ceremonies; and these in religion, the ancienter they be the better, so they may fit time and place. Too many overburden the service of God, and too few leave it naked. And scarce anything hath hurt religion more in these broken times than an opinion in too many men, that because Rome had thrust some unnecessary and many superstitious ceremonies upon the Church, therefore the Reformation must have none at all; not considering therewhile, that ceremonies are the hedge that fence the substance of religion from all the indignities which profaneness and sacrilege too commonly put upon it. And a great weakness it is, not to see the strength which ceremonies,—things weak enough in themselves, God knows,—add even to religion itself; but a far greater to see it and yet to cry them down all and without choice, by which their most hated adversaries climbed up, and could not cry up themselves and their cause as they do but by them. And

[Matt. v. 16.]

divines, of all the rest, might learn and teach this wisdom if they would, since they see all other professions which help to bear down their ceremonies, keep up their own therewhile, and that to the highest.

I have been too bold to detain your Majesty so long; but my grief to see Christendom bleeding in dissension, and, which is worse, triumphing in her own blood, and most angry with them that would study her peace, hath thus transported me; for truly
Phil. ii. 21. it cannot but grieve any man that hath bowels to see "all men seeking," but as St. Paul foretold, "their own things, and not the things which are Jesus Christ's": *sua*, "their own" surely; for the Gospel of Christ hath nothing to do with them: and to see religion so much, so zealously pretended and called upon, made but the stalking-horse to shoot at other fowl upon which their aim is set; in the meantime, as if all were truth and holiness itself, no salvation must be possible, did it lie at their mercy, but in the communion of the one, and in the conventicles of the other; as if either of these now were, as the Donatists of old reputed themselves, the only men in whom Christ at His coming to judgment should find faith. No, saith St. Augustine, and so I say with him, *Da veniam, non credimus*, "Pardon us, I pray, we cannot believe it."[16] The Catholic Church of Christ is neither Rome, nor a conventicle. Out of that there is no salvation, I easily confess it. But out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle too; salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave. In this ensuing Discourse, therefore, I have endeavoured to lay open those wider gates of the Catholic Church confined to no age, time, or place;
Jude 3. nor knowing any bounds but that "faith which was once"—and but once for all—"delivered to the saints." And in my pursuit of this way, I have searched after, and delivered with a single heart, that truth which I profess. In the publishing whereof I have obeyed your Majesty, discharged my duty to my power to the

[16] [Sed nempe hoc est totum, quod nobis persuadere conaris, solos remansisse Rogatistas, qui catholici recte appellandi sint, ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum atque omnium sacramentorum; et vos esse solos, in quibus inveniat fidem, cum venerit, Filius hominis. Da veniam, non credimus.—But the whole point, to which you try to persuade us, is this: that you Donatists are the sole remnant who have any right to the name of Catholics by your observance of all the divine commands and all the Sacraments; and that you are the only people whom the Son of Man when He cometh will find faithful. Pardon us, I pray, we cannot believe it.]—S. Augustin. [*ad Vincentium Rogatistam*,] *Epist.* [xciii. olim] xlviii. [cap. 7. Migne, ii. 333.]

Church of England, "given account of the hope that is in me," and so testified to the world that faith in which I have lived, and by God's blessing and favour purpose to die; but, till death, shall most unfeignedly remain, 1 Pet. iii. 1

Your Majesty's most faithful Subject, and

Most humble and obliged Servant,

W. CANT.

[NOTE.

King Charles very highly appreciated this Book, and took great pains to disseminate it. Herbert, who attended him in his last hours, tells us that he gave as his final present to the Princess Elizabeth Andrewes' *Sermons*, *Archbishop Laud against Fisher* (which book the King said would ground her against Popery) and also Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Herbert's *Memoirs*, p. 130.]

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

THE discussion between Archbishop Laud and Fisher the Jesuit, of which this Book is an enlargement, took place in London at York House on the 24th day of May, 1622.

The occasion is not hard to realise. About the state of things in 1622, as the reign of James I. drew towards its close, we have abundance of historical information. The faces of the strong men and beautiful ladies of the period look out upon us full of animation and character from the portraits of Vandyke and Myttens. Vandyke was painting in England only ten years later: Myttens came across a little earlier; both painted portraits of Laud, Vandyke in the Archbishop's worn old age, Myttens in the heyday of his vigorous activity. These painters and their rivals make us thoroughly familiar with the style of dress, the manners and the outward appearance of the leading Englishmen and Englishwomen of the time. The religious thoughts which stirred and comforted our ancestors then still discharge the same function for us in the works of the two religious poets who, with very different genius, represent the tendencies of the two contemporary schools of religion. George Herbert went to Bemerton eight years later, in 1630; when the Conference took place he was a candidate for a Secretaryship of State and a prominent figure at Court. John Milton was on the point of going up to Christ's College, Cambridge. It is the party which Herbert represents which held the predominant place in the Court and in the King's councils. Dean Williams, Lord Keeper, and now also Bishop of Lincoln, was elaborating fine musical services in Westminster Abbey; Laud, a few years later, was undertaking the restoration of old St. Paul's. A crowd of great preachers led their listeners to beautiful and artistic worship. England was becoming richer every year,

and there was plenty of leisure to discuss art and religion. London grew by leaps and bounds to be the largest and the richest city in the world; so rapidly was it spreading that it frightened the rulers of the country, and they were constantly putting out useless proclamations against the building of new houses.

In this time of wealth, of art, of devout worship, of eager partisanship, the nation had rather gone beyond the leading powers of King James and of the very Conservative House of Commons. The tone of society was eager, and it craved for novelty; and two young men, on whose character a word must be said, were eager to lead it, and yet uncertain what direction to choose. Both Buckingham and Prince Charles might easily at this time have become Roman Catholics. The Conference at York House gave Laud a decisive influence upon their future.

Vandyke has painted a score of times the dreamy, mystical, somewhat irresolute face of Charles, the son and heir of James I. The finest statue in London, which checks and holds the sightseer for a moment at the busiest crossing in the streets of Westminster, represents the unfortunate king, and carries back the dullest imagination to the days when Charles was living at Whitehall. It was modelled in his palmy days by the genius of the famous French sculptor, who was drawn over to England by the attraction of the Stuart patronage of art, Le Sueur. And close by the statue still stands the remnant of the ancient Palace of our Kings, that Banqueting Hall which Inigo Jones built for King James when he began the reconstruction of his somewhat confused and inconvenient residence at Whitehall, straggling over the sites occupied now by many a dusty Government Office, but then the centre of discussion and pleasure and thought and government.

On the occasion of this Conference, Prince Charles was a young man, and in that happy period when he thought he could overcome with ease every difficulty which arose in his path. A few months later he was to start on that unpractical but poetical adventure which took him to Madrid to remove the dilatory opposition of the Spanish Rulers and to bring back his bride in triumph to England. The failure of this expedition turned his mind to the achievement of a policy like the policy of Queen Elizabeth and made him the idol of the warlike City Apprentices and the Protestant Hero of the Puritan Country Gentlemen. Charles might have been added to the list of English Conquerors

if the masters of the apprentices would only have opened their money bags and if the country gentry had been willing to pay for the policy which they so noisily advocated in Parliament. This short-lived popularity he shared with the Master of York House, for whose special edification the discussions at this Conference took place, the Marquis of Buckingham, George Villiers.

When we think of the man the story seems almost incredible. A long argument was held day after day between a Roman Catholic champion in controversy and grave and learned Anglican Divines. We should feel such a conference possible now only before the leader of a religious party or some middle-aged philosopher. But Buckingham was barely 30 years old; he was the leader of the pleasures of the Court, a famous sportsman, a daring fighter, a master of the revels, the prince of the polite youth of the generation.

This Marquis, or, as he soon became, Duke of Buckingham, is one of the most puzzling characters in history. He came up to court, a few years before this Conference, simple George Villiers, the child of a very ordinary country gentleman, a younger son with a future to make. He raised himself to be favourite and master of two successive kings. The first of them, James I., was a sovereign of much sagacity and statecraft. But he had one very serious though amiable weakness: he was a devotee of peace; he could never bear to guide his country into war. Born in Scotland, the most quarrelsome country in the world, brought up amid murder and battle and assassination, he found physical courage the hardest quality to attain. A few months before his birth, his father had murdered his mother's favourite musician, David Rizzio, in her presence chamber and before her eyes. A few months after his birth, his father, by his mother's plotting, as all men believed, was blown up in his bed and found killed amid the ruins of his house. The King, almost from his cradle, was surrounded by fierce nobles who would never have hesitated to kill him to increase their power; once a dagger was held at his throat by a desperate peer as he grew up to manhood. No wonder that he shuddered at the sight of cold steel. Weak in the legs, and ungainly in person, and quickly frightened, the King naturally admired men who were handsome, alert, and brave.

James was growing tired of his favourite Somerset, when young Villiers came to Court. This man, Robert Carr, created Earl of Somerset, was cruel and avaricious and unprincipled; finally he had

become disgraced in the eyes of the nation and had lost the admiring affection of the King. Some clever and important courtiers, among them the Puritan Archbishop Abbot, brought George Villiers forward; he was to be the champion of the extreme Protestant party and the prop of the Parliamentary Opposition. James was charmed with him immediately. Somerset was driven from the Court. There was nothing the King would not do to please his new friend.

Soon he was created Marquis of Buckingham and became practically the chief of the King's Ministers. Master of the Horse, he managed the King's household. Lord High Admiral, he was responsible for the safety of the country. One of the Howards, the greatest family in England, had been Lord High Admiral before him. This nobleman, when Lord Howard of Effingham, gained a somewhat exaggerated fame by his victory over the Armada which Hawkins and Drake had won for him. Under James, as Earl of Nottingham, he had wasted enormous sums in letting the fleet go to ruin. It had become necessary to turn him out of office; and Buckingham had taken his place. Buckingham had the sense to choose skilled advisers, and the fleet was prosperous for a time.

Everybody admired his handsome figure and his daring demeanour. He dazzled the people by the splendour of his dress and following. Crowds liked to see something fine. No one could gratify them better than the graceful Buckingham. He was "the Marquis" in England, just as James was "the King," and Charles "the Prince": or as Wellington was "the Duke" in the days of our fathers. Every eye turned to him. King and Prince alike treated him as far above all other subjects, as their equal indeed; and his voice was the strongest of the three when a decision was to be made.

The Marquis liked money, but he was not avaricious: he spent it; and people admire splendid spending. He was not mean; he had no petty spites or cramped desires. He wanted England to be great; and he wanted to be the man who made her great. Only he had no special capacity for achieving great things; but then that sort of capacity is very rare. It is true also that he was overbearing; but just as overbearing to the Percies of Northumberland and the Howards of Arundel as he was to low born and feeble folk.

Thus he was sometimes looked upon in England as a fiend who

was the cause of every trouble, and sometimes as a heaven-sent leader who was to be the champion of religious freedom and English supremacy. The English people were a very excitable race in those days, not so unlike the French of to-day. They had not gained the sober common-sense which 200 years of Parliamentary rule has developed.

There were two men in England whose talents and position might have influenced the government. But they were both under a cloud. One was Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, who had been driven from the office of Lord Chancellor by the fierce attack made on him in the House of Commons in 1621. The other was George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, who had at one time enjoyed an immense influence over the King; but had lost it from his want of genial manner. He had done the Church good service by persuading the Scots to receive anew the Order of Bishops into their Presbyterian system. But in 1622 his Calvinistic teaching, his firm belief in the divine decrees and in the policy of the Synod of Dort, his savage hatred of Popery, his unwillingness to impose upon the Puritans the forms and ceremonies of the Prayer Book, were out of fashion. He had grown cross and short-tempered; he was felt to be a disagreeable person in the Court. His hold on Buckingham was entirely gone.

As Abbot grew unpopular at Court, a marked change began to show itself in the religious temper of the upper classes of society. The King's heart was set on gaining the Infanta of Spain as a wife for the Prince of Wales; to do this, he had suspended the laws against Roman Priests, and he allowed many Jesuits and others to reside in London under merely nominal restraint. These men won over a number of courtiers, and had been very successful in persuading the Countess of Buckingham, the mother of the favourite, to listen to their arguments. One of the most successful of these Roman Catholic advocates was a man known as Fisher the Jesuit.[1] He had gained a special influence over the Countess, and through her even made much impression on the Marquis.

[1] The true name of this Fisher was, it seems, Percy. He was born in the North of England, and was brought over to the Church of Rome when he was about 14. He was educated at Rheims and then at Rome. He was at the time of the Conference a prisoner, but his confinement was only nominal. Later on he was released at Laud's request. He persuaded Chillingworth, Laud's godson, to become a Romanist for a short time. He also brought over Buckingham's brother. He died after 1641.

The King became very anxious lest the two should go over; if they went, what might not be the effect on the Prince of Wales himself? He called in several divines to settle them to a firm belief in the doctrines of the English Church. But these divines were not altogether successful, and the King's own reasons had not the effect he anticipated. He then thought of the clever and capable ecclesiastic who had been for some years one of his chaplains and had recently been consecrated to the See of St. David's, Dr. William Laud. He made up his mind to entrust to him the part of champion of the English Church at the final discussion held with Fisher.

William Laud was born in Reading on the 7th of October, 1573. He was the child of well-to-do people in trade, and had relatives who prospered in business in London. He went up to St John's College, Oxford, and became a prominent teacher. The University in those days was under the leadership of George Abbot, the Master of University College, and Robert Abbot, Master of Balliol. The other leading men were all Puritans except Buckeridge, the President of St John's. Calvin's *Institutes* was the chief text-book; the Divine Decrees the dominant principle of opinion and life. Learning flourished ill, and men thought more of discussions in divinity than of hard work for their degrees. The alehouses were convenient places for such discussions, and no less than 300 of them existed at this time in the city of Oxford. The natural result followed, much disorder and quarrelling.

Laud grew famous as an opponent of the fashionable doctrine of the Divine Decrees. His enemies called him an Arminian. He maintained that the human will was free, and that each man was responsible for his own conduct in life. He would not join in the fashionable denunciations of Rome, but considered the Roman a part, though a very corrupt part, of the Church of Christ. The Reformation he treated as a very valuable reform, but a reform of a living Church, not the overthrow of a dead Church. He was eager for a fuller study of the Eastern languages and for a fuller knowledge of Church history and for intercourse with that wonderful East from which Christianity had come, and in which there were still such a number of Christians. He was a quick, witty, argumentative man, of small stature—very attractive and lively. He soon formed a strong party. When Dr. Buckeridge was consecrated Bishop of Rochester, Laud took his place as head of St John's in 1611. In 1616 he was appointed Dean of

Gloucester, and in 1621 Bishop of St David's; he was then 48.[1] This was the man who was called upon to take a principal part in the final Conference at York House. As he himself tells us, there was but little time given him for preparation. The matter had only been brought before him by King James a month earlier, and he was still more suddenly directed to one point in the controversy between Rome and England which the Marquis and his mother, the Countess of Buckingham, felt had not yet been handled to their satisfaction. This was a part which the Jesuit Fisher was constantly pressing upon them, and which seemed to them the crucial point in the whole discussion.

The Jesuit asked, Where is the true Church to be found? The Romans, he pointed out, denied the possibility of salvation in the English Communion; the English did not deny that it was possible for a Romanist to be saved. His advice therefore was, be on the safe side and follow the Pope. The appeal was seductive enough to the haughty, pushing, self-indulgent lady, who wanted to get all the enjoyment out of this life and yet to be safe and comfortable in the life to come. It was settled therefore that Fisher and Laud should discuss this at the meeting on May 24, 1622, in York House.

The King does not seem to have been present at any part of the discussion. Perhaps he distrusted his power of silence; yet wished to leave the field quite open to Laud. He evidently received a full report, and thoroughly enjoyed the cleverness and depth of the arguments. In the previous discussions we know that he had himself been the advocate for the English Church through one whole day. Nor is there any sign of the presence of the Prince, who also, we know, set a very high value on Laud's treatment of the point at issue, and in later life considered the book which Laud published to be the best authority on the question.

The mother of the favourite was there—preferring Rome as the safer and pleasanter course—but a little frightened how this would affect the King, and afraid she might lose in court favour what she

[1] Laud became Bishop of Bath and Wells 1626, Bishop of London 1627, a Privy Councillor in 1626; after the death of Buckingham in 1628, he was the most trusted of the King's Ministers till December, 1640, when he was imprisoned by the Long Parliament. In 1633 he was translated to Canterbury. He was executed on January 10th, 1645. For full accounts of him see the Editor's *Life and Times of Archbishop Laud.* John Murray, 1894.

gained in mental comfort. The Marquis's wife was present, once Lady Katherine Manners, heiress of the great house of Rutland, charming but unstable. She had been brought up as a Roman Catholic, and had been persuaded by Dr. Williams, the Lord Keeper and Bishop of Lincoln, to renounce Rome and to be received into the Church of England. Was it love or was it conviction which brought her over? At all events she went back to Rome some years hence, after her husband's death, and became a great trouble to her dead husband's friends, Laud and the rest.

The Marquis himself was present — evidently wavering — wondering whether to become leader of the Protestant party against Spain, or the dominant ally and practical ruler of the somewhat sleepy and slow-moving Roman Catholics—but with some high principles about him which would not allow his religion to become a mere mask for his selfishness, as his mother would.

Lord Keeper Williams was there: a Welshman of humble origin, who had succeeded Bacon as Keeper of the King's Conscience, Speaker of the House of Lords, and Minister of Justice. He was also the Chief Judge in England, though he had been bred a clergyman and not a lawyer; and a good judge, too, by all accounts, studying his law under clever advisers, and deciding by a shrewd commonsense what was justice.

Who else may have been present we do not know. To the people of the day, the all-important question was this, Will the Bishop or will the Jesuit persuade Buckingham? Fisher arrived first and was able to suggest certain difficulties to his Patroness before the other Champion appeared.

As the Reader will notice, the arguments on both sides are still the familiar arguments of the present day.

The Initials used in the Conference are:

B. Bishop Laud.
F. Fisher the Jesuit.
D. W. Dr. Francis White.
L. K. Lord Keeper Williams.
A. C. used by Fisher in his answers to Laud.

C. H. S.

A RELATION OF THE CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

WILLIAM LAUD,

THEN LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S; NOW LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY;

AND

MR. FISHER THE JESUIT,

BY THE COMMAND OF KING JAMES OF EVER BLESSED MEMORY:

WITH AN ANSWER TO SUCH EXCEPTIONS AS
A. C. TAKES AGAINST IT.

[CHAPTER I.

The Infallible Church.

Summary of Argument.

Occasion of the Conference. Its subject is a continuous, infallible, visible Church.

Bellarmine rests his proof, that "the particular Roman Church" cannot err but is infallible, on three passages in the Fathers, viz., from (1) Cyprian, (2) Jerome, and (3) Gregory Nazianzen. He refers also to Cyril and Rufinus, but without giving references. Laud examines the passages used in evidence point by point, in order to show that no infallibility is therein attributed to the Roman Church. He then challenges the infallibility of the Roman Church and claims that it has erred; it (1) teaches the worship of images, and (2) alters the Sacrament of Holy Communion. Rome has erred; and there is no particular infallible Church.

The position of the Greek Church is afterwards brought forward by Fisher's assertion that the Greeks have fallen into false doctrine about the procession of the Holy Ghost. Laud replies that the difference between the Western and Eastern Churches on this matter is merely a difference of words and expressions, not of dogmatic teaching. He produces strong theological support for this position from Peter Lombard, Bonaventura, Bellarmine, etc. He maintains that the difference between the East and the West on this doctrine is not fundamental; but arose from the Easterns' annoyance at the arrogance of the Western Church in defining the doctrine without a General Council. The point is at once started for debate—What is fundamental?]

F. The occasion of this conference was . . . § 1.

B. The occasion of this third conference you should know sufficiently. You were an actor in it, as well as in two other. Whether you have related the two former truly, appears by

[CHAPTER I.] Doctor White,[1] the late Reverend Lord Bishop of Ely, his relation, or exposition of them. I was present at none, but this third; of which I here give the church an account. But of this third, whether that were the cause which you allege, I cannot tell. You say,

> ℱ. [for that] it was observed, that in the second conference [with Dr. White,] all the speech was about particular matters; [and] little or none about a continual, infallible, visible Church, which was the chief and only point in which a certain lady required satisfaction; as having formerly settled in her mind, that it was not for her, or any other unlearned persons, to take upon them to judge of particulars, without depending upon the judgment of the true Church.

§ 2. ℬ. The opinion of that honourable person in this, was never opened to me. And it is very fit the people should look to the judgment of the Church, before they be too busy with particulars. But yet neither scripture, nor any good authority, denies them some moderate use of their own understanding and judgment, especially in things familiar and evident; which even ordinary[2] capacities may as easily understand, as read. And therefore some particulars a Christian may judge without depending.

1 Cor. x. 15.

> ℱ. This lady, therefore, having heard it granted in the first conference, That there must be a continual, visible

[1] [Dean of Carlisle, and one of His Majesty's Chaplains at this time; he had held two conferences with Fisher before this, in the presence of Lady Buckingham; consecrated Bishop of Carlisle in 1626; translated to Norwich in 1628; to Ely in 1631; died in 1638.]

[2] Quis non sine ullo magistro, aut interprete ex se [sese] facile cognoscat, [non illud in Christo mortuum esse quod Deus est, sed illud in illo mortuum esse quod homo est?] [Who needs a teacher or an interpreter to make him understand that what was dead in Christ was not the Godhead but the manhood?]—Novatian. *de Trin.* c. 23. Et loquitur de mysterio passionis Christi. [Novatian is speaking about the mystery of Christ's passion.]—Dijudicare est mensurare, etc. Unde et mens dicitur a metiendo. [To decide is to measure, whence the faculty which does this is called mind, the measuring power.] Tho. [Aquin. *Summ.*] pars 1. Q[uæst]. 79. A[rt]. 9. ad 4. [p. 145.]—Migne, i. 1122. To what end then, is a mind and an understanding given a man, if he may not apply it to measure truth? Et διάνοια [dicitur] ἀπὸ τοῦ διανοεῖν, *i.e.* ab eo quod considerat, ac discernit. [The mind is styled the discerning faculty; because it discerns and distinguishes.]—Damasc. l. ii. *Fid. Orth.* c. 22. Quia [ait Damasc.] discernit inter verum et falsum. [It discerns between the true and the false.]

And A. C. himself, p. 41, denies not all judgment to private men; but says, "they are not so to rely absolutely upon their private judgment, as to adventure salvation upon it alone, or chiefly"; which no man will deny.

company ever since Christ, teaching unchanged doctrine in all fundamental points, that is, [in all] points necessary to salvation, desired to hear this confirmed, and proof brought [to show] which was that continual, infallible,[3] visible Church, in which one may, and out of which one cannot, attain salvation. And, therefore, having appointed a time of meeting between a [certain] B. and me, and thereupon having sent for the B. and me, before the B. came, the lady, and a friend of hers, came first to the room where I was, and debated before me the aforesaid question, and not doubting of the first part, to wit, That there must be a continual visible Church, as they had heard granted by Dr. White, and L. K. [viz. the Lord Keeper] [etc.] . . . SECTION II.

I. B. What Dr. White and the Lord Keeper granted, I heard not: but I think, both granted a continual and a visible Church; neither of them an infallible, at least in your sense. And yourself, in this relation, speak distractedly; for, in these few lines, from the beginning hither, twice you add "infallible" between "continual" and "visible," and twice you leave it out. But this concerns Dr. W., and he hath answered it. § 3.

II. Here A. C.[4] steps in, and says, "The Jesuit did not speak distractedly, but most advisedly. For," saith he, "where he relates what Dr. White or L. K. granted, he leaves out the word 'infallible,' because they granted it not; but where he speaks of the lady, there he adds it, because the Jesuit knew it was an infallible Church which she sought to rely upon." A. C. p. 42.

[3][The Chaplain noting the word *infallible* to be sometimes put in, sometimes left out, taxeth Mr. Fisher of speaking distractedly. But I note herein, that Mr. Fisher spoke most advisedly, and with precise care of punctual truth: for when he speaketh of what was observed, or desired by the lady, he putteth in the word *infallible*, because he knew it was an infallible Church which she sought to rely upon. But when he speaketh of what Dr. White or L. K. granted, he leaveth it out, because they did not mention the word *infallible*, but only granted a visible Church in all ages, teaching unchanged doctrine, in all matters necessary to salvation.—A. C. *True Relations of sundry Conferences.*]

[4][A. C. is the title under which Fisher answered Laud's first account of the Conference. He published this book in 1626. The passage, from "here A. C. steps in" to the end of this section 3, does not exist in the edition of 1624, (Laud's first answer); it was added in 1639. Thus in the first edition the discussion about the Greek Church virtually opens the Conference, and therefore enables us to appreciate the picturesqueness of the scene at York House with Fisher instructing the Countess of Buckingham, the Marquis and the Lord Keeper and a few more in the stately parlour, when Laud is shown in.]

[Chapter I.] How far the Catholic Militant Church of Christ is infallible, is no dispute for this place, though you shall find it after. But sure the Jesuit did not speak most advisedly, nor A. C. neither, nor the lady herself, if she said she desired to rely upon an infallible Church. For an infallible Church denotes a particular Church, in that it is set in opposition to some other particular Church, that is not infallible. Now I, for my part, do not know what that lady desired to rely upon. This I know: if she desired such a particular Church, neither this Jesuit, nor any other, is able to show it her; no, not Bellarmine himself, though of very great ability to make good any truth, which he undertakes for the Church of Rome. But no strength can uphold an error against truth,[5] where truth hath an able defendant. Now, where Bellarmine[6] sets himself purposely to make this good, that "The particular Church of Rome cannot err in matter of faith,"[7] out of which it follows, that there may be found a particular infallible Church, you shall see what he is able to perform.

III. 1. First, then, after he hath distinguished, to express his meaning, in what sense the particular Church of Rome cannot err in things which are *de fide*, of the faith; he tells us, this firmitude is, because the See Apostolic is fixed there. "And this," he saith, "is most true."[8] And for proof of it, he brings three Fathers[9] to justify it.

(1.) The first, St. Cyprian,[10] whose words are, "That the

[5] [Nam ipsa] vincat necesse est, sive negantem, sive confitentem. [For truth must convince a man whether he denies or admits it at first.]—S. Augustin. *Epist.* 174. [238 *ad Pascentium*, sect. 29. *Op.*, Migne, ii. 1049.] Occultari potest ad tempus veritas, vinci non potest. [Truth can be hidden for a time; it cannot be overcome.]—S. Aug. [*Enarr.*] *in Psalm* lxi. [sect 16. *Op.*, Migne, iv. 740.]

[6] [Roberto Bellarmino was born in Tuscany in 1542; was made Cardinal by Clement VIII. and Archbishop of Capua. He was a member of the Society of Jesus; and it is thought might have been chosen Pope in the place of Leo XI. and again of Paul V. if he had not been a Jesuit. He died in 1621, having left public life in 1613. He was the most famous controversialist of his time.]

[7] Lib. iv. *De Rom. Pont.* c. 4. sect. 1. [Secunda Propositio: Non solum Pontifex Romanus] non potest errare in fide, sed neque Romana particularis Ecclesia. [Not only is the Roman Pope unable to err; but also the particular Roman Church.]

[8] *Ibid.* sect. 2.

[9] [Viz., Cyprian, p. 6; Jerome, p. 11; Gregory Nazianzen, p. 14. See Bellarmin, lib. iv.; *De Rom. Pont.* c. 4. § 3.]

[10] [Post ista adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto,] navigare audent, [et] ad Petri Cathedram atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, [unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis literas ferre;] nec cogitare eos esse Romanos [quorum fides apostolo prædicante (*Rom.* i.) laudata est,] ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum.—*Ep.* 3. [After these proceedings the heretics went on to appoint a sham bishop, and

Romans are such, as to whom *perfidia* cannot have access." Now, *perfidia* can hardly stand for error in faith, or for misbelief; but it properly signifies malicious falsehood in matter of trust and action; not error in faith, but in fact, against the discipline and government of the Church. And why may it not here have this meaning in St. Cyprian?[11]

IV. For the story there[12] it is this. In the year 255, there was a council in Carthage, in the cause of two schismatics, Felicissimus and Novatian,[13] about restoring of them to the communion of the Church which had lapsed, in time of danger, from Christianity to idolatry. Felicissimus would admit all, even without penance; and Novatian would admit none, no, not after penance. The Fathers, forty-two in number, went, as the truth led them, between both extremes. To this council came Privatus, a known heretic, but was not admitted, because he was formerly excommunicated, and often condemned. Hereupon he gathers his complices together, and chooses one Fortunatus, (who was formerly condemned, as well as himself,) Bishop of Carthage, and set him up against St. Cyprian. This done, Felicissimus and his fellows haste to Rome with letters testimonial from their own party, and pretend that twenty-five bishops concurred with them; and their desire was to be received into the communion of the Roman Church, and to have their new bishop acknowledged. Cornelius,[14] then pope,

dared to take ship and to bring letters to Peter's Chair and the leading church from which the Episcopal (sacerdotalis in Cyprian) unity took its origin; and they never considered that their hosts would be Romans whose faith is commended in the Apostle's preaching (*Rom.* i.), and who could not be accessible to "perfidia" (viz., perfidy or error in faith). Cf. Note 15.]—Cypr. l. i. [*Ep.* lv. ad Cornelium de Fortunato et Felicissimo, *Op.*, p. 86. ed. Benedict. Duchesne translates principalis ecclesia, the sovereign church. The idea is evidently from the princeps senatus, the leading man in the Republican Senate of equals.]

[11] [St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 248-258 A.D., was converted to Christianity in 246, when he was already grown up; was elected bishop shortly afterwards; and suffered martyrdom in 258 during the Valerian Persecution. His proper style was Pope of Carthage. He was in constant communication with Cornelius and Stephen, Popes of Rome, whom he always treats on a footing of equality.]

[12] *Bin. Concil.* tom. i. p. 152. edit. Paris, 1636. [*Concil. Roman.* ii.—*Concil.* ed. Labb. et Cossart., tom. i. col. 715, A. B. C.] Baron. *Annal.* an. 253, [num. 109,] 254, [num. 32—107,] 255, [num. 1—30, tom. ii. ed. Romæ, 1594.]

[13] [Novatian seems here confused with Novatus. Novatian was a Roman presbyter; Novatus was an African presbyter in Carthage. Felicissimus was a deacon of the Carthaginian Church. The first Council of Carthage was held in 251; the second in 252. 252 was the date of the consecration of Fortunatus as rival Bishop of Carthage against Cyprian. The dates are very difficult to ascertain exactly.]

[14] [Cornelius, a man of noble family, was elected Pope in March 251

[CHAPTER I.] though their haste had now prevented St. Cyprian's letters, having formerly heard from him both of them and their schism in Africa, would neither hear them nor receive their letters. They grew insolent and furious (the ordinary way that schismatics take). Upon this, Cornelius writes to St. Cyprian; and St. Cyprian, in this epistle, gives Cornelius thanks for refusing these African fugitives, declares their schism and wickedness at large, and encourages him, and all bishops, to maintain the ecclesiastical discipline and censures against any, the boldest, threatenings of wicked schismatics. This is the story; and in this is the passage here urged by Bellarmine. Now I would fain know why *perfidia*, all circumstances considered, may not stand here in its proper sense, for cunning and perfidious dealing, which these men, having practised at Carthage, thought now to obtrude upon the Bishop of Rome also, but that he was wary enough not to be overreached by busy schismatics?

V. (2.) Secondly, let it be granted that *perfidia*[15] doth signify here, error in faith and doctrine. For I will not deny but that among the African writers, and especially St. Cyprian, it is sometimes so used; and therefore here, perhaps. But then this privilege, of not erring dangerously in the faith, was not made over absolutely to the Romans, that are such by birth and dwelling only; but to the Romans, *qua tales*, as they were such as those first were, "whose faith was famous through the world," and as long as they continued such; which, at that time, it seems they did. And so St. Cyprian's words seem to import, *eos esse Romanos*, that the Romans then, under Pope Cornelius, were such as the apostle spake of, and therefore to whom, at that time (or any time, they still remaining such), perfidious misbelief could not be welcome; or rather, indeed, perfidious misbelievers or schismatics could not be welcome. For this very phrase, *perfidia non potest habere accessum*, directs us to understand the word in a concrete sense:

Rom. i. 8.

(see discussion as to date in Benson's *Cyprian*). He died in banishment in June 253, and is honoured as a martyr. In his time Novatian made a schism in the Roman Church and was consecrated as rival Pope.]

[15] [Perfidia is used in this sense by Cyprian in *Epistle* 55, and in the *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, p. 197, Benedictine edition: s.v. perfidia the Benedictine edition gives reference only to passages in which it is so used. The classical use appears to be always "treachery." See for the treatment of important passages in Cyprian by the modern Roman controversialists, Benson's *Cyprian*, p. 200 ff.]

"perfidiousness could not get access"; that is, such perfidious persons, excommunicated out of other Churches, were not likely to get access at Rome, or to find admittance into their communion. It is but a metonymy of speech, the adjunct for the subject; a thing very usual even in elegant[16] authors, and much more in later times, as in St. Cyprian's, when the Latin language was grown rougher. Now, if it be thus understood, I say, in the concrete, then it is plain, that St. Cyprian did not intend by these words to exempt the Romans from possibility of error, but to brand his adversaries with a title due to their merit, calling them perfidious, that is, such as had betrayed or perverted the faith. Neither can we lose by this construction, as will appear at after.

VI. (3.) But thirdly, when all is done, what if it be no more than a rhetorical excess of speech; *perfidia non potest*, for *non facile potest*; it "cannot," that is, "it cannot easily?" Or what if St. Cyprian do but *laudando præcipere*, by commending[17] them to be such, instruct them that such indeed they ought to be, to whom perfidiousness should not get access? Men are very bountiful of their compliments sometimes. Synesius,[18] writing to Theophilus of Alexandria, begins thus: Ἐγὼ καὶ βούλομαι, καὶ ἀνάγκη μοι θεία, [νόμον ἡγεῖσθαι τοῦτο ὅ τι ἂν ἐκεῖνος ὁ θρόνος θεσπίσῃ·] "I both will, and a divine necessity lies upon me, to esteem it a law, whatsoever that throne," (meaning his of Alexandria,) "shall determine." Nay, the word is θεσπίζειν, and that signifies to determine like an oracle, or as in God's stead. Now, I hope you will say, this is not to be taken dogmatically; it is but the epistoler's courtesy only. And why not the like here? For the haste which these schismatics made to Rome prevented St. Cyprian's letters; yet Cornelius, very careful of both the truth and peace of the

[16] . . . Ego tibi istam Scelestam, *scelus*, linguam abscindam. [Wretch, I will cut out your wretched tongue.]—Plaut. *Amphit.* [act ii. sc. 1. v. 6.]—Ex hac enim parte *pudor* pugnat, illinc *petulantia*, &c. [On the one side modest men are the champions; on the other petulant men.]—Cic. *in* [*L. Catilin. Orat.* ii. sect. 25. (al. 11.)]—

. . . latuit plebeio tectus amictu
Omnis *honos*: nullos comitata est purpura *fasces*.

[None noted the officials as they passed, clothed in working clothes; the consuls were not clad in purple.]—Lucan. [*de Bell. Civil.*] lib. ii. [18].

[17] Nec cogitare eos esse Romanos, quorum fides apostolo prædicante, &c. [v. supra, p. 6, note 10.]

[18] *Epist.* 67.

[Born in 370, consecrated by Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, to the See of Ptolemais 410; died *circa* 414.]

Church, would neither hear them, nor receive their letters, till[19] he had written to St. Cyprian. Now this epistle is St. Cyprian's answer to Cornelius, in which he informs him of the whole truth; and withal gives him thanks for refusing to hear these African fugitives. In which fair way of returning his thanks, if he make an honourable mention of the Romans and their faith with a little dash of rhetoric, even to a *non potest* for a *non facile potest*, it is no great wonder.

VII. But, take which answer you will of the three, this is plain, that St. Cyprian had no meaning to assert the unerring infallibility of either Pope or Church of Rome. For this is more than manifest by the contestation which after happened between St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen,[20] about the rebaptization of those that were baptized by heretics; for he saith[21] expressly, that "Pope Stephen did then not only maintain an error, but the very cause of heretics, and that against Christians and the very Church of God." And after this he chargeth him with obstinacy and presumption.[22] I hope this is plain enough to show, that St. Cyprian had no great opinion of the Roman infallibility: or if he had it when he writ to Cornelius, certainly he had changed it when he wrote against Stephen. But I think it was no change; and that, when he wrote to Cornelius, it was rhetoric, and no more.

VIII. Now, if any man shall say, that, in this point of rebaptization, St. Cyprian himself was in the wrong opinion, and Pope Stephen in the right, I easily grant that; but yet that error of his takes not off his judgment, what he thought of the Papal or Roman infallibility in those times. For though afterwards[23] St. Cyprian's opinion was condemned in a council at

[19] For so St. Cyprian begins his epistle to Cornelius. Legi literas tuas, frater.—[S. Cyprian. *Epist.* lv. *ad Cornelium*, *Op.*, p. 79. ed. Benedict.] And after: Sed enim lecta alia tua epistola, frater, &c.—S. Cypr. lib. i. *Epist.* 3. [*Epist.* lv. *ad Cornelium*, *Op.*, p. 80.]

[20] [Succeeded Cornelius in 254 as Bishop of Rome.]

[21] Stephanus frater noster hæreticorum causam contra Christianos et contra ecclesiam Dei asserere conatur. [Stephen our brother is trying to maintain the cause of heretics against Christians and against the Church of God.]—S. Cypr. *ad Pompeium contra Epist. Steph.* edit. per Erasmum, Basil. p. 327. [*Epist.* lxxiv. p. 138. *Op.*, ed. Benedict.]

[22] Stephani fratris nostri obstinatio dura. [The unyielding obstinacy of our brother Stephen.]—*Ibid.* p. 329. And it would be marked by the Jesuit and his A. C., that still it is *Stephani fratris nostri* [our brother Stephen], and not *capitis* [our head], or *summi pastoris nostri* [our chief pastor].

[23] Caranza in Concil. Carthag. sub Cornel. fine.—[Caranzæ *Summ. Concil.* p. 38. ed. Duaci, 1679. This Council, (the third of those held at Carthage and not received by the Church,) is of the date A.D. 258, (al. 256,) during

Rome under Cornelius, and after that by Pope Stephen, and after both in the first Council of Carthage,[24] yet no one word is there in that council which mentions this as an error, that he thought Pope Stephen might err in the faith, while he proclaimed he did so. In which, though the particular censure which he passed on Pope Stephen was erroneous, for Stephen erred not in that, yet the general which results from it, namely, that for all his being in the popedom, he might err, is most true.

IX. 2. The second Father which Bellarmine cites, is St. Jerome:[25] his words are:[26] "The Roman faith commended by the apostle, admits not such *præstigias*, 'deceits and delusions,' into it, though an angel should preach it otherwise than it was preached at first, (and) being armed and fenced by St. Paul's authority, cannot be changed." Where, first, I will not doubt but that St. Jerome speaks here of the faith; for the *præstigiæ* here mentioned are afterwards more plainly expressed: for he tells us after,[27] "That the Bishop of Rome had sent letters into the East, and charged heresy upon Ruffinus."

the pontificate of Pope St. Stephen I., not St. Cornelius.—Cf. *Concil.*, tom. i. col. 796. C.]

[24] Can. I. [This Council, held during the pontificate of Pope St. Julius I.—not St. Sylvester I., as Caranza incorrectly states—by Gratus, Archbishop of Carthage, A.D. 348, was not strictly the first Council of Carthage, for several had been held there under St. Cyprian; but it is styled the first Council of Carthage, "quia inter orthodoxa et approbata Concilia Carthagine habita, ea quæ etiamnum extant, primum sit et antiquissimum." Because it was the first and most ancient of the orthodox and approved Councils held at Carthage of those whose proceedings still exist. (Bin. *not. Concil.* tom. ii. col. 719.)]

[25] [Born A.D. 346, Deacon of the Roman Church, secretary to Pope Damasus, and a strong upholder of the Roman See; left Rome for Bethlehem A.D. 385, and died 420. He revised the Latin Bible, and took part in all the controversies of his time.

[26] Attamen scito Romanam fidem Apostolica voce laudatam, istiusmodi, præstigias non recipere, *etiam si* Angelus aliter annunciet, quam semel prædicatum est, Pauli auctoritate munitam non posse mutari. [Know however that the Roman faith, preached by the voice of an Apostle, does not accept such delusions even if an angel should proclaim a change in that which has been already preached, for it rests on the authority of Paul and cannot be moved.]—S. Hieron. lib. iii. *Apol. contra Rufinum*, tom. ii. fol. 84, K. ed. Paris, 1534. [*adv. Rufin.* lib. iii. *Op.*, tom. iv. par. ii. col. 449, ed. Benedict.] Peradventure it is here to be read *et jam si*, for so the place is more plain, and more strong; but the answer is the same.

[27] Deinde, ut epistolas contra te ad Orientem mitteret, et cauterium tibi hæreseos, [dum nescis,] inureret; diceretque libros Origenis περὶ ἀρχῶν, a te translatos, et simplici Romanæ Ecclesiæ plebi traditos, ut fidei veritatem quam ab Apostolo didicerant, per te perderent. [Afterwards he sent letters against you to the East, and branded you with the brand of heresy; and said that the books of Origen 'about the Beginnings of things' had been translated by you and given to the simple people of the Roman Church in order that by your means they might lose the true faith, which they had learnt from the Apostle.]—S. Hieron. *ibid.* fol. 85. K. [*Ibid.* col. 457.]

[CHAPTER I.] And further, "that Origen's books περὶ ἀρχῶν were translated by him, and delivered to the simple people of the Church of Rome, that by his means they might lose the verity of the faith, which they had learned from the apostle." Therefore the *præstigiæ* before mentioned, were the cunning illusions of Ruffinus,[28] putting Origen's book under the martyr Pamphilus' name, that so he might bring in heresy the more cunningly under a name of credit, and the more easily pervert the people's faith. So, of the faith he speaks. And secondly, I shall as easily confess that St. Jerome's speech is most true, but I cannot admit the Cardinal's sense of it: for he imposes upon the word *fides*. For by *Romana fides*, the Roman faith, he will understand the particular Church of Rome; which is as much as to say, *Romanos fideles*, the faithful of that Church; and that no wily delusions, or cozenage in matter of faith, can be imposed upon them. Now, hereupon I return to that of St. Cyprian; if *fides Romana* must signify *fideles Romanos*, why may not *perfidia* before signify *perfidos*? especially since these two words are commonly used by these writers, as terms opposite;[29] and therefore, by the law of opposition, may interpret each other proportionably. So with these great masters—with whom it is almost grown to be, *quod volumus, rectum est*, what we please, shall be the author's meaning—*perfidia* must signify absolutely error in faith, or misbelief; but *fides* must relate to the persons, and signify the faithful of the Roman Church. And now I conceive my

[28] [Rufinus published a translation of Pamphilus' *Defence of Origen* and a number of Origen's works, *circa* A.D. 398. He had a long and bitter controversy with Jerome. He was born in 345, for twenty years was a monk on the Mount of Olives, and died in 410.]

[29] Qui cum fidei [et virtutis] dux [fratribus] esse non potuerit, perfidiæ [et audaciæ et temeritatis magister] existat. [Since he could not be the leader of his brethren in faith and virtue, he comes forth as their teacher in faithlessness (perfidia), and in audacity, and in daring.]—S. Cyprian. lib. i. *Epist.* 7. [*Epist.* lxiv. *ad Epictetum*, pp. 110, 111.]—Fidem perfidi, [religionem profani. The faith of a traitor, the religion of an impious man].—*Ibid.* [p. 111]. Ex ovibus subito facti sunt vulpes, ex fidelibus perfidi. [They were suddenly changed from sheep to wolves, from faithful to faithless.]—S. Optatus, lib. vii. [lib. vi. c. 8. *De Schism. Donatist. Op.*, p. 100. ed. Dupin. 1700.] Quomodo eis prosit cum baptizantur parentum fides, quorum eis non potest obesse perfidia? [How can their parents' faith do them good at their baptism, when their parents' faithlessness cannot do them harm?]—S. Aug. *Epist.* xxiii. [xcviii. *ad Bonifacium*, Migne, ii. 359. Quanto [ergo] potius fides aliena potest consulere parvulo, cui sua perfidia [non potest imputari?] [How can another's faith help a tiny child when his faithlessness cannot be imputed to it?]—S. Aug. lib iii. *de Lib. Arb.* c. 23. [c. 67. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 637. F. ed. Benedict.]

answer will proceed with a great deal of reason. For *Romana fides*, "the Roman faith," as it was commended by the apostle, of which St. Jerome speaks, is one thing, and the particular Roman Church, of which the Cardinal speaks, is another. The faith indeed admits not *præstigias*, wily delusions, into it; if it did, it could not be "the whole and undefiled faith" of Christ, which they learned from the apostle; and which is so fenced by apostolical authority as that it cannot be changed, though an angel should preach the contrary. But the particular Church of Rome hath admitted *præstigias*, divers crafty conveyances, into the faith, and is not fenced as the faith itself is; and therefore, though an angel cannot contrary that, yet the bad angel hath sowed tares in this. By which means *Romana fides*, though it be now the same it was for the words of the Creed, yet it is not the same for the sense of it, nor for the *super* and *præter* structures built upon it, or joined unto it. So the Roman faith, that is, the faith which St. Paul taught the Romans, and after commended in them, was all one with the Catholic faith of Christ. For St. Paul taught no other than that one; and this one can never be changed in or from itself by angel or devil. But in men's hearts it may receive a change; and in particular churches it may receive a change; and in the particular Church of Rome it hath received a change. And ye see, St. Jerome himself confesses, that the Pope himself was afraid *ne perderent*,[30] lest by this art of Ruffinus, "the people might lose the verity of the faith." Now that which can be lost, can be changed; for usually habits begin to alter, before they be quite lost. And that which may be lost among the people, may be lost among the bishops, and the rest of the clergy too, if they look not to it; as it seems they after did not at Rome, though then they did. Nay, at this time the whole Roman Church was in danger enough to swallow Origen's book, and all the errors in it, coming under the name of Pamphilus; and so St. Jerome himself expressly, and close upon the place cited by Bellarmine. For he desires Ruffinus to "change the title of the book,"[31] that error may not be spread

[30] Ne fidei veritatem quam ab Apostolo didicerant, per te perderent. [Lest they should lose by your means the true faith which they had learnt from the Apostle.]—[S. Hieron. ut sup. note 26.]

[31] Muta titulum, et Romanum simplicitatem tanto periculo libera. [Change the title and free the simple Romans from this great danger.]—[S. Hieron.] *Ibid.* fol. 84. K. [col. 449].

[CHAPTER I.]

under the specious name of Pamphilus, "and so to free from danger the Roman simplicity." Where, by the way, Roman unerring power now challenged, and Roman simplicity then feared, agree not very well together.

X. 3. The third Father alleged by Bellarmine, is St. Gregory[32] Nazianzen.[33] And his words are, "That ancient Rome from of old hath the right faith, and always holds it, as becomes the city which is governess over the whole world, to have an entire faith in and concerning God." Now certainly it became that city very well, to keep the faith sound and entire. And having the government of a great part of the world then in her power, it became her so much the more, as her example thereby was the greater. And in St. Gregory Nazianzen's time, Rome did certainly hold both *rectam et integram fidem*, the right and the whole entire faith of Christ. But there is nor promise nor prophecy in St. Gregory, that Rome shall ever so do. For his words are plain; *semper decet*, "it always becomes" that great city to have, and to hold too, *integram fidem*, "the entire faith." But at the other *semper*, it is *retinet*,[34] that city from of old "holds" the right faith yet; but he saith not *retinebit semper*, that the city of Rome "shall retain it ever," no more than it shall ever retain the empire of the world. Now it must be assured that it shall ever hold the entire faith of Christ, before we can be assured that that particular Church can never err, or be infallible.

[*decet semper*, it becomes that great city always to have . . . Editt. 1673 and 1686.]

XI. Besides these, the Cardinal names[35] Cyrillus and Ruffinus,

[32] [Born 325. Bishop of Constantinople in 381; soon resigned; and died in 389. He was the chief figure at the Oecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381.]

[33] Vetus Roma ab antiquis temporibus habet rectam fidem, et semper eam retinet, sicut decet urbem, quæ toti orbi præsidet, semper de Deo integram fidem habere. [Ancient Rome of old time has the right faith, and always keeps it; as it is suitable for the city which is pre-eminent in the whole world always to have a correct faith about God.] [The "always" (semper) is not in the Greek text.]—Greg. Naz. *in Carmine de Vita Sua*, ante medium, p. 9. ed. Paris. 1609.

[Δύω μὲν οὐ δέδωκεν ἡλίους φύσις,
Δισσὰς δὲ Ῥώμας, τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης
Λαμπτῆρας, ἀρχαῖόν τε καὶ νέον κράτος,
Τόσον διαφέροντας ἀλλήλων, ὅσον
Τὴν μὲν προλάμπειν ἡλίου, τὴν δ' ἑσπέρας·
Κάλλει δὲ κάλλος ἀντανίσχειν συζύγως.
Τούτων δὲ πίστις, ἡ μὲν ἦν ἐκ πλείονος,
Καὶ νῦν ἔτ' ἔστιν εὔδρομος, τὴν ἑσπέραν
Πᾶσαν δέουσα τῷ σωτηρίῳ λόγῳ,
Καθὼς δίκαιον τὴν προέδρον τῶν ὅλων,
Ὅλην σέβουσαν τὴν Θεοῦ συμφωνίαν·
Ἡ δ' ἦν τοπρόσθεν ὀρθόπους, νῦν δ' οὐκέτι.
κ.τ.λ. 562-573, *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 704. ed. Paris. 1840.]

[34] The words in the Greek are ἡ μὲν ἦν ἐκ πλείονος, καὶ νῦν ἔτ' ἔστιν εὔδρομος. Hæc quidem fuit diu, et nunc adhuc est rectigrada [it was of old and still is correct]; ἔστιν, *est;* so St. Gregory says, but of an ἔσται, or a *retinebit* [will keep] he says nothing.

[35] [Item Cyrillus et Ruffinus, non solum pontificem, sed etiam Ecclesiam

but he neither tells us where, nor cites their words. Yet I think I have found the most pregnant place in St. Cyril[36] and that makes clearly against him. For I find expressly these three things: First, that the Church is inexpugnable, and that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against it," but that it shall *in perpetuum manere*, "remain for ever." And this all Protestants grant. But this that it shall not fall away, doth not secure it from all kinds of error. Secondly, Bellarmine quotes St. Cyril for the particular Roman Church; and St. Cyril speaks not of the Roman at all, but of the Church of Christ, that is, the Catholic Church. Thirdly, that the foundation and firmness, which the Church of Christ hath, is placed not in, or upon, the person,[37] much less the successor, of St. Peter; but upon the faith[37] which by God's Spirit in him, he so firmly possessed: which is the common received opinion both of the ancient Fathers and the Protestants. "Upon this rock," that is, upon this faith, "will I build my Church." So here is all the good he hath gotten by St. Cyril, unless he can cite some other place of St. Cyril, which I believe he cannot.

Sectio III.

S. Matt. xvi. 18.

XII. And for Ruffinus, the place which Bellarmine aims at, is in his Exposition upon the Creed; and is quoted in part the chapter before.[38] But when all his words shall be laid

Romanam, asseruerunt non posse errare. Cyril also and Rufinus maintained that not only the Roman Pope but also the Roman Church could not err.—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pontif.* lib. iv. c. 4. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 812. B.]

[St. Cyril was the champion of the Church against Nestorius, Patriarch of Alexandria, 412-444.]

[36] Petram opinor peragnominationem [quasi denominative] nihil aliud, quam inconcussam et firmissimam discipuli fidem vocavit. In qua, Ecclesia Christi ita fundata et firmata esset, ut non laberetur, et esset inexpugnabilis inferorum portis, in perpetuum manens. —Cyril. Alex. *Dial. de Trin.* lib. iv. p. 278. Paris. an. 1604. [Πέτραν οἶμαι παρωνύμως, ἕτερον οὐδὲν ἢ τὴν ἀκατάσειστον καὶ ἐδραιοτάτην τοῦ μαθητοῦ πίστιν ἀποκαλῶν, ἐφ' ᾗ καὶ ἀδιαστάτως ἐρήρεισταί τε καὶ διαπέπηγεν ἡ ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ, καὶ αὐταῖς ἀνάλωτος ταῖς ᾅδου πύλαις εἰσαεὶ διαμένουσα. I think that by bringing together two words (with different meanings, but of similar sound, Latin) of slightly different sound (Greek), He called the disciple's unshaken and firmly-rooted faith Petra, *i.e.* a Rock: on which faith the Church of Christ is so firmly founded that it would not fall down, and would be unconquerable by the gates of hell, and remain for ever.—*De Sancta Trinitate Dialog.* iv. *Op.*, tom. v. pp. 507. E 568. A. ed. Paris. 1638. Migne, viii. 865.]

[37] *Et ego dico tibi*) hoc est, tuæ confessioni, quâ mihi dixisti, Tu es Christus. [And I say to thee, that is to thy confession, in which thou hast said to Me, "Thou art Christ."] *Et super hanc petram*) hoc est, fidei hujus firmitatem et fundamentum. Vel, super hanc petram quam confessus es, hoc est, super Meipsum ipsum lapidem angularem. [And on this rock, that is, on the solid foundation of this faith. Or, on this rock of which thou hast made confession, that is, on Myself as the corner-stone.]—Dion[ysii] Carthus[iani *in quatuor Evangelia Enarrationes*, art. xxix.] in *St. Matth.* xvi. 18. [fol. lv. C. ed. Paris. 1542.]

[38] Bellar. lib. iv. *de Rom. Pont.* cap. iii. sect. penult.

[CHAPTER I.]

together, they will make no more for Bellarmine and his cause, than the former places have done. Ruffinus' words then run thus:[39] "Before I come to the words of the Creed, this I think fit to warn you of:—That in divers Churches some things are found added to the words (of the Creed). But in the Church of the city of Rome, this is not found done: and as I think, it is for that no heresy did take its rise or beginning there; and for that the old custom is there observed, namely, that they which are to receive the grace of baptism do publicly repeat the Creed in the hearing of the people, who would not admit such additions. But in other places, as far as I can understand, by reason of some heretics, some things were added, but such as were to exclude the sense of their novel doctrine." Now these words make little for Bellarmine, who cites them, and much against Ruffinus that uttered them. They make little for Bellarmine. First, because, suppose Ruffinus' speech to be true, yet this will never follow: in Ruffinus' time, no heresy had taken its beginning at Rome; therefore no heresy hath had rooting there so many hundred years since. Secondly, Bellarmine takes upon him there to prove, that the particular Church of Rome cannot err. Now neither can this be concluded out of Ruffinus' words. First, because, as I said before, to argue from *non sumpsit* to *ergo sumere non potest*, —no heresy hath yet begun there, therefore none can begin there, or spring thence,—is an argument drawn *ab actu ad potentiam negative*, from the act to the power of being, which every novice in learning can tell proceeds not negatively. And common reason tells every man, it is no consequence to say, Such a thing is not, or hath not been, therefore it cannot be. Secondly, because though it were true, that no heresy at all did ever take its beginning at Rome, yet that can never prove that the particular Church of Rome can never err, (which is

[39] Illud non importune commonendum puto, quod in diversis ecclesiis aliqua in his verbis inveniuntur adjecta. In ecclesia tamen urbis Romæ hoc non deprehenditur factum: [quod ego] pro eo [esse] arbitror, quod neque hæresis ulla illic sumpsit exordium, et mos ibi servatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam baptismi suscepturi sunt, publice, id est, fidelium populo audiente, symbolum reddere, et utique adjectionem unius saltem sermonis, eorum qui præcesserunt in fide non admittit auditus. In cæteris autem locis, quantum intelligi datur, propter nonnullos hæreticos addita quædam videntur, per quæ novellæ doctrinæ sensus crederetur excludi, etc.—Rufin. *in Exposit. Symbol.* (ut habetur inter Opera S. Cypriani,) Præfat. Expos. [*Opusc.* vulgo S. Cypr. adscript. col. cxcix. ad calcem ed. Benedict.]

the thing in question). For suppose that no heresy did ever begin there, yet if any, that began elsewhere, were admitted into that Church, it is as full a proof that that Church can err, as if the heresy had been hatched in that nest. For that Church errs which admits a heresy into it, as well as that which broaches it. Now, Ruffinus says no more of the Roman Church than *non sumpsit exordium*, "no heresy took its beginning there"; but that denies not, but that some heretical taint might get in there. And it is more than manifest, that the most famous heresies in their several times made their abode even at Rome. And it is observable too, that Bellarmine cites no more of Ruffinus' words than these: *In ecclesia urbis Romæ neque hæresis ulla sumpsit exordium, et mos ibi servatur antiquus*, as if this were an entire speech; whereas it comes in but as a reason given of the speech precedent; and as if Ruffinus made the Church of Rome the great observer of the customs of the Church; whereas he speaks but of one particular custom of reciting the Creed before baptism. But after all this, I pray, Did no heresy ever begin at Rome? Where did Novatianism begin? At Rome, sure. For Baronius,[40] Pamelius,[41] and Petavius,[42] do all dispute the point, whether that sect was denominated from Novatianus the Roman priest, or Novatus the African bishop; and they conclude for Novatian. He then that gave that name is in all right the founder, and Rome the nest, of that heresy: and there it continued with a succession[43] of bishops from Cornelius to Cælestine, which is near

[40] Baron. tom. ii. an. 254. num. 62. [Baronius, member of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, cardinal, published the Annals of the Church, between 1588 and 1607.]

[41] Pamel. in Cyprian. *Epist.* xli. [Erat hic Novatianus Ecclesiæ Romanæ presbyter. . . . Hic autem primum in ecclesia schisma concitavit. . . . Eusebius et Nicephorus . . . uterque, et sic etiam Socrates, vicinitate nominum (sc. Novatiani et Novati) falsi, Novatum illum vocant non recte. This Novatian was a priest of the Roman Church . . . he first stirred a schism in the Church. Both Eusebius and Nicephorus, and also Socrates, deceived by the similarity of names, call him Novatus.—In *Epist.* xli. *ad Cornelium*, p. 80. ed. Paris. 1616, et p. 55. ed. Benedict.] et lxxiii. [Hinc etiam patet a Novatiano dictos illos hæreticos, non a Novato. It is thus made evident that those heretics are named after Novatian and not after Novatus.—*Id.* in *Epist.* lxxiii. *ad Jubaïanum*, *Op.*, p. 188, et p. 129. Ed. Benedict.]

[Jacobus Pamelius published in 1571 the *Liturgy of the Latins*.]

[42] Petavius in *Epiphan. Hæres.* lix. [Petavius, a Jesuit, published his *De Doctrina Temporum* in 1627; died in 1652.]

[43] Onuph. in *Notis ad Plat. in vita Cornelii.* [Post S. Fabiani obitum et Cornelii electionem, primum in Ecclesia Romana schisma fuisse constat. Novatianus enim quidam presbyter S.R.E. ambitionis spiritu inflatus . . . pontificatum contra Cornelium Romæ assumpsit . . . a quo hæresis Novatianorum manavit.

[CHAPTER I.] upon two hundred years. Nay, could Ruffinus himself be ignorant that some heresy began at Rome? No, sure. For in this I must challenge him either for his weak memory or his wilful error; for Ruffinus had not only read Eusebius' history, but had been at the pains to translate him. Now, Eusebius[44] says plainly, that "some heretics spread their venom in Asia, some in Phrygia, and others grew at Rome, and Florinus[45] was the ringleader of them." And more clearly after, "Irenæus" saith he, "directed divers epistles against this Florinus, and his fellow Blastus, and condemns them of such heresies as threw them and their followers into great impiety, etc.; those at Rome corrupting the sound doctrine of the Church." Therefore most manifest it is, that some heresy had its rise and beginning at Rome. But to leave this slip of Ruffinus, most evident it is, that Ruffinus neither did nor could account the particular Church of Rome infallible; for if he had esteemed so of it, he would not have

. . . Hujus Novatiani in episcopatu successores Romæ usque ad Cælestini Papæ pontificatum permanserunt. After the death of St. Fabian and the election of Cornelius, the first schism in the Roman Church took place. For a certain presbyter of the Church, called Novatian, puffed up with ambition, assumed the Pontificate of Rome in opposition to Cornelius. From him sprang the heresy of the Novatians, and there were episcopal successors of this Novatian at Rome until the time of Pope Celestine, viz. 422 A.D. —Onuphr. in *Platin. Vit. Pontific.* p. 33. ed. Colon. 1568.]

[44] Hæretici alii in morem venenatorum serpentum in Asiam et Phrygiam irrepserunt, *οἱ δ' ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ἤκμαζον*, quorum Dux Florinus. Some heretics like venomous snakes crept into Asia and Phrygia, and others flourished at Rome, and Florinus was their chief.—Euseb. lib. v. cap. 14. And in Rufinus' translation, c. 15. [Sed in urbe Romæ Florinus quidam gradu presbyteri de ecclesia lapsus una cum Blasto socio criminis et furoris, plurimos de ecclesia in suum barathrum deducebant nova adversum veritatem figmenta machinantes. But in the city of Rome a certain Florinus of priestly rank having forsaken the Church, together with Blastus who helped him in his crime and his madness, drew away many from the Church into his abyss, by inventing new lies against the truth.—p. 115. B. Euseb. Ruffino interpret. apud *Autor. Hist. Ecclesiast.* ed. Frobenii, Basil. 1539.] And then afterwards, c. 19 and 20. *ἐξ ἐναντίας δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τὸν ὑγιῆ τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεσμὸν παραχαραττόντων*, [*Εἰρηναῖος διαφόρους ἐπιστολὰς συντάττει· τὴν μὲν ἐπιγράψας, πρὸς Βλάστον περὶ σχίσματος· τὴν δὲ πρὸς Φλωρῖνον περὶ μοναρχίας, ἢ περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸν θεὸν ποιητὴν κακῶν·* But, on the other side, when the people at Rome were falsifying the sound rule of the Church, Irenæus composed several epistles: one he wrote to Blastus about schism, another to Florinus about the monarchia, or about God not being the author of evil. Euseb. *Ibid.* p. 237. ed. Reading.] Now this Blastus taught that God was the author of sin.

[45] [A contemporary of Irenæus, he had been, like Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp; he pushed monarchianism to such an extreme as to make God the author of evil. Irenæus (died 202 A.D.) wrote to reason with him, appealing to the instruction of their mutual master, Polycarp of Smyrna.]

dissented from it in so main a point as is the canon of the Scripture, as he plainly doth; for, reckoning[46] up the canonical books, he most manifestly dissents from the Roman Church. Therefore, either Ruffinus did not think the Church of Rome was infallible, or else the Church of Rome at this day reckons up more books within the canon than heretofore she did. If she do, then she is changed in a main point of faith, the canon of Scripture, and is absolutely convinced not to be infallible; for if she were right in her reckoning then, she is wrong now; and if she be right now, she was wrong then; and if she do not reckon more now than she did when Ruffinus lived, then he reckons fewer than she, and so dissents from her; which doubtless he durst not have done, had he thought her judgment infallible. Yea, and he sets this mark upon his dissent besides,[47] that he reckons up the books of the canon just so and no otherwise than as "he received them out of the monuments of the forefathers, and out of which the assertions of our faith are to be taken." Last of all, had this place of Ruffinus any strength for the infallibility of the Church of Rome, yet there is very little reason that the pope and his clergy should take any benefit by it. For St. Jerome[48] tells us, That when Ruffinus was angry with him for an epistle which he writ not, he plainly sent him to the Bishop of Rome,

[46] Rufin. in *Exposit. Symbol.* p. 188. [sect. 37, 38. col. ccxxiv. ad calcem S. Cyprian. ed Benedict. He distinguishes between the Canonical Books and the Ecclesiastical Books which form the Apocrypha.] In which reckoning he plainly agrees with the Church of England, Art. vi.

[47] Novi ac veteris Testamenti volumina, etc., sicut ex Patrum monumentis accepimus.—Rufin. in *Symb.* p. 188. [sect. 36. col ccxxiv.]—Et hæc sunt quæ Patres intra Canonem concluserunt; et ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt. [And these are those which the Fathers included in the Canon, and out of which they decided to prove the statements of our faith.] *Ib.* p. 189.

[48] Si [autem] Romani Episcopi est, stulte facis ab eo exemplar Epistolæ petere, cui missa non est, etc. Vade potius Romam, et præsens apud eum expostula, cur tibi et absenti et innocenti fecerit injuriam. Primum, ut non reciperet expositionem fidei tuæ, quam omnis, ut scribis, Italia comprobavit; [et baculo tuarum uti noluerit literarum contra canes tuos.] Deinde, ut [Epistolas contra te ad Orientem mitteret, et] cauterium tibi hæreseos, dum nescis, inureret. [But if it comes from the Bishop of Rome, you are foolish to ask for a copy of the letter from a man to whom none such has been sent. . . . Go rather to Rome, and expostulate with him face to face, for abusing you in your absence and when you are innocent; First, that he did not receive your exposition of faith which according to your letter all Italy approved: and would not use your letter as a rod against the dogs who howl against you: Next that he sent letters into the East against you, and branded you with the brand of heresy behind your back.] S. Hieron, *Apol.* iii. *advers. Rufin.* fol. 85. K. [*Op.*, tom. iv. par ii. col. 457.]

[CHAPTER I.]

and bade him expostulate with him for the contumely put upon him, in that he received not his exposition of the faith, which, said he, all Italy approved; and in that he branded him also, *dum nesciret*, "behind his back," with heresy. Now, if the pope which then was, rejected this exposition of the creed made by Ruffinus, and branded him besides with heresy, his sentence against Ruffinus was just or unjust. If unjust, then the pope erred about a matter of faith; and so neither he nor the Church of Rome infallible. If just, then the Church of Rome labours to defend herself by his pen, which is judged heretical by herself. So, whether it were just or unjust, the Church of Rome is driven to a hard strait, when she must beg help of him whom she branded with heresy, and out of that tract which she herself rejected; and so uphold her infallibility by the judgment of a man, who in her judgment had erred so foully. Nor may she by any law[49] take benefit of a testimony which herself hath defamed and protested against.

Seven, Ed. 1673 and 1686.]

XIII. With these Bellarmine is pleased to name six popes, which, he saith, are all of this opinion. But he adds,[50] "that these testimonies will be contemned by the heretics." Good words, I pray! I know whom the Cardinal meant by heretics

[49] Quum quis se velle personas testium post publicationem repellere fuerit protestatus. Si quid pro ipso dixerint, iis non creditur. [When a man has protested that he wishes to repel particular witnesses after the publication of their names: should they say anything on his behalf, they are not to be believed.]—Extra. Tex. et ibi Gloss. c. *Præsentium*, xxxi. de Testibus. [This is not from the Extravagantes, but from the Decretals of Gregory IX.—Lib. ii. sect. xx.; de Testibus, cap (xxxi.) *Præsentium*.]

[50] Bell. lib. iv. *de Rom. Pontif.* c. 4. sect. 5. [Nam auctores citati, ut Lucius et Felix. papæ et martyres; Agatho et Nicolaus, papæ et confessores . . . non solum pontificem, sed etiam Ecclesiam Romanum, asseruerunt non posse errare] . . . Addo etiam [duorum pontificum testimonia,] quæ etsi ab hæreticis contemnantur, [tamen a Catholicis cum honore recipienda sunt. Unum est *Martini Papæ V.* Alterum *est Sixti Papæ IV.* (an. 1478.) For the witnesses, whom I quote, Lucius and Felix, popes and martyrs, Agatho and Nicolas, popes and confessors . . . declared that not only the Pope but also the Roman Church could not err. . . . I add also the witness of two popes, which, though they will be rejected by the heretics, must be received with respect by Catholics. One is from Martin V. (1418 A.D.); the other from Sixtus IV. (1478 A.D.) Of these witnesses the two earliest, viz. Pope Lucius (A.D. 256) and Pope Felix (A.D. 273) are quoted by Bellarmine from the false Decretals, and their writings are now admitted on all sides to be spurious. These pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (so called from Isidore of Seville, a famous collector of Decretals) appear first at Maintz in the ninth century, and are first quoted authoritatively by Pope Nicholas (858-867 A.D.). They consist of a number of decisions contained in letters, and supposed to have been issued by the early Popes, beginning with Clement; they include the famous pseudo-Donation of Constantine the Emperor.]

very well; but the best is, his call cannot make them so. Nor shall I easily contemn six ancient bishops of Rome concurring in opinion, if apparent verity in the thing itself do not force me to dissent; and in that case I shall do it without contempt too. This only I will say,[51] that six popes concurring

[51] Nenimi in sua causa credendum, nisi conformiter ad legem divinam: naturalem, et canonicam loquatur: [juri autem divino et naturali repugnat, caput ministeriale imperium habere absolutum in Ecclesiam. No one is to be believed giving witness on his own behalf, except he speak in accordance with the Divine Law, the Law of Nature, and the Canon Law. But it is contrary to the Divine Law and the Law of Nature that a minister should have absolute rule in the Church.] So Jo. Gerson, and the doctors of Paris cited in *Lib. Anon. de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate*, c. xvi. ed. Paris. 1612. Now these popes do not speak here conformably to these laws. —[The author of this work, first published anonymously, Paris. 1612, was Edmund Richer, Syndic of the faculty of divinity in the Sorbonne. Of the circumstances attending its publication, a full account is in Bossuet, *Def. Cler. Gal.* lib. vi. cap. 25. Oeuvres de Bossuet, tom. xxxii. p. 389. ed Versailles. 1817. An English translation of it appeared in the same year, under the title "A Treatise of Ecclesiasticall and Politike Power, &c. Faithfully translated out of the Latin originall, of late publicly printed and allowed in Paris. Now set foorth for a further warrant and encouragement to the Roman Catholikes of England, for theyr taking of the Oath of Allegiance; seeing so many others of their owne profession in other countries doe deny the Popes infalibility in judgement and temporall power over Princes, directly against the doctrine of Jesuits." London. 1612. The last and most complete edition of the work, with the Defences, documents, references, etc., together with some curious opuscula connected with it, is that of Cologne, 1701, in two volumes quarto. In Lib. i. cap. i. sect. 12. of the *Defensio Libelli de Eccl. et Politic. Potest.* tom. i. p. 12. ed. Colon., Richer recites the ancient doctrine held on the Gallican liberties by the Paris Schools. These principles are fully indicated in the Decree which they passed in 1429, against John Sarrazin, (printed in the *Libell. de Eccl. et Politic. Potest. Demonst.* cap. xviii.) and repeated in the Decree of 1611, (printed in the preface to the *Def. Libelli*, etc. p. i.—iii.) Sarrazin in his recantation subscribed the following articles, which may be considered as a summary of the views of Gerson, Almain, etc., formally embodied by their successors in the Parisian Schools:—1. Omnes potestates jurisdictionis Ecclesiasticæ, aliæ a papali potestate, sunt ab ipso Christo quantum ad institutionem et collationem primariam: a Papa autem et ab Ecclesia quantum ad limitationem et dispensationem ministerialem.—2. Hujusmodi potestates sunt de jure divino, et immediate institutæ a Deo.—3. Invenitur in sacra Scriptura Christum Ecclesiam fundasse, et potestates alias a papali expresse ordinasse.—4. Quandocunque in aliquo concilio aliqua instituuntur, tota auctoritas dans vigorem statutis residet non in solo summo Pontifice, sed principaliter in Spiritu Sancto et Ecclesia Catholica.—5. Ex textu Evangelii et doctrina apostolorum habetur expresse, apostolis et discipulis a Christo missis auctoritatem jurisdictionis fuisse collatam.—6. Dicere inferiorum prælatorum potestatem jurisdictionis, sive sint episcopi, sive sint curati, esse immediate a Deo, evangelicæ et apostolicæ consonat veritati.—7. Aliqua potestas, scilicet potestas Ecclesiæ, de jure potest aliquid in certis casibus contra summum pontificem. — 8. Quicunque purus viator habens usum rationis cujuscumque dignitatis, auctoritatis aut præeminentiæ, etiamsi Papalis existat, simoniam potest commit-

[CHAPTER I.]

in opinion shall have less weight with me in their own cause than any other six of the more ancient Fathers. Indeed, could I swallow Bellarmine's[52] opinion, that the pope's judgment is infallible, I would then submit without any more ado. But that will never down with me, unless I live till I dote, which I hope in God I shall not.

XIV. Other proofs than these Bellarmine brings not to prove that the particular Church of Rome cannot err in or from the faith; and of what force these are to sway any judgment, I submit to all indifferent readers. And having thus examined Bellarmine's proofs that the particular Church of Rome cannot err in faith, I now return to A. C. and the Jesuit, and tell them, that no Jesuit, or any other, is ever able to prove any particular Church infallible.

A. C. p. 42.

XV. But for the particular Church of Rome, and the pope with it, erred it hath, and therefore may err. Erred I say it hath, in the worship of images, and in altering Christ's institution in the blessed sacrament, by taking away the cup from the people, and divers other particulars, as shall appear at after.[53] And as for the ground which is presumed to secure this Church from error, it is very remarkable how the learned Cardinal[54]

tere.—1. Every authority carrying ecclesiastical jurisdiction, except the papal authority, derives indeed from Christ Himself its original institution and appointments, but from the Pope and from the Church its ministerial limitation and stewardship.—2. Authorities of this kind are by divine right, and appointed direct by God.—3. We find in the Holy Scriptures that Christ founded the Church, and expressly ordained other powers besides the papal.—4. Whenever in any Council anything is decreed, the whole authority which gives power to the statutes resides not in the supreme Pontiff by himself, but primarily in the Holy Spirit and in the Catholic Church.—5. It is expressly proved from the text of the Gospel and the teaching of the Apostles that a power of jurisdiction was bestowed on the Apostles and disciples sent out by Christ.—6. It is agreeable to the truth taught by the Gospel and by the Apostles to say that the power of jurisdiction possessed by the inferior prelates, whether bishops or curates, comes direct from God.—7. A power, that is the power of the Church, has rights in certain cases against the supreme Pontiff.—8. Every Christian having the use of any kind of dignity, authority, or pre-eminence, even the papal is capable of committing simony.]

[52] Lib. iv. *de Rom. Pont.* c. iii. [Sit igitur prima propositio: Summus Pontifex, cum totam ecclesiam docet, in his quæ ad fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest. — Therefore let our first proposition be "The supreme Pontiff, when he teaches the whole Church, in matters which pertain to the faith, can in no case err."]

[53] [*V. infra,*] Sect. xxxiii. Consideration, vii. 5, 12.

[54] Romana Ecclesia particularis non potest errare, persistente Romæ apostolica sede. Propositio hæc est verissima, et fortasse tam vera quam illa prima de Pontifice. [The particular Roman Church cannot err, so long as the Apostolic See remains at Rome. This is a most true proposition and it seems equally true with the first proposi-

speaks in this case; for he tells us, that this proposition, So long as St. Peter's chair is at Rome, that particular Church cannot err in the faith, is *verissima*, "most true"; and yet, in the very next words, it is *fortasse tam vera*, "peradventure as true" as the former: that is, That the pope, when he teaches the whole Church in those things which belong to the faith, cannot err in any case. What! is that proposition "most true," and yet is it but at a "peradventure it is as true as this"? Is it possible any thing should be absolutely most true, and yet under a peradventure that it is but as true as another truth? But here, without all peradventure, neither proposition is true. And then, indeed, Bellarmine may say, without a *fortasse*, that this proposition, The particular Church of Rome cannot err, so long as the see apostolic is there, is as true as this: The pope cannot err, while he teaches the whole Church in those things which belong to the faith. For neither of them is true. But he cannot say that either of them is *verissima*, "most true," when neither of them hath truth.

XVI. 2. Secondly, if the particular Church of Rome be infallible, and can neither err in the faith nor fall from it, then it is because the see apostolic cannot be transferred from Rome, but must ever, to the consummation of the world, remain there, and keep that particular Church from erring. Now, to this what says Bellarmine? What? Why, he tells us,[55] that it is a pious and most probable opinion to think so. And he reckons four probabilities that it shall never be removed from Rome. And I will not deny but some of them are fair probabilities; but yet they are but probabilities, and so unable to convince any man. Why but then, what if a man cannot think as Bellarmine doth, but that, enforced by the light of his understanding, he must think the quite contrary to this, which Bellarmine

tion concerning the Pope.]—Lib. iv. *de Rom. Pont.* c. 4. § 2.—And that first proposition is this: Summus Pontifex, cum totam ecclesiam docet, in his quæ ad fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest. [The Supreme Pontiff, when he teaches the whole Church in matters which pertain to the faith, cannot err.]—*Ibid.* c. 3. § 1.

[55] [Quod nihilominus tamen] pia et probabilissima sit sententia, non posse separari Petri Cathedram a Roma, et proinde Romanam Ecclesiam absolute non posse errare, nec deficere, [probatur primo ex eo quod tamdiu mansit Romæ sedes Apostolica non obstantibus infinitis persecutionibus, etc. That however for all this, it is a pious and most probable opinion that the Chair of St. Peter cannot be removed from Rome, and further that the Roman Church is absolutely incapable of error or failure, is proved in the first place by the fact that the Apostolic See has remained so long at Rome in spite of numberless persecutions, etc.]—Bellarm. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. c. 4. sect. 5.

[CHAPTER I.] thinks pious, and so probable? What then? Why, then Bellarmine himself tells you, that "the quite contrary proposition to this," namely, that St. Peter's chair may be severed from Rome, and that then that particular Church may err, "is neither heretical nor manifestly erroneous."[56] So then, by Bellarmine's own confession, I am no heretic, nor in any manifest error, if I say, as indeed I do, and think it too, that it is possible for St. Peter's chair to be carried from Rome, and that then at least, by his own argument, that Church may err.

XVII. Now, then, upon the whole matter, and to return to
A. C. p. 42. A. C. If that lady desired to rely upon a particular infallible Church, it is not to be found on earth. Rome hath not that gift, nor her bishop neither. And Bellarmine, who, I think, was as able as any champion that Church hath, dares not say it is either heresy or a manifest error to say, that the apostolic see may be removed thence, and that Church not only err in faith, but also fall quite away from it. Now I, for my part, have not ignorance enough in me to believe that that Church which may apostatize at some one time, may not err at another; especially since both her erring and failing may arise from other causes besides that which is mentioned by the Cardinal. And if it may err, it is not infallible.

℣. The question was, Which was that Church? A friend of the lady's would needs defend, that not only the Roman, but also the Greek Church,[57] was right.

§ 4. ℟. When that honourable personage answered, I was not by to hear. But I presume he was so far from granting that only the Roman Church was right, as that he did not grant it right; and that he took on him no other defence of the poor Greek Church than was according to truth.

℣. I told him, That the Greek Church had plainly changed, and taught false in a point of doctrine concerning the

[56] Contraria sententia nec est hæretica, nec manifeste erronea.—[Bellarm.] lib. iv. *de Rom. Pont.* c. 4. sect. 5. [At secundum.]

[57] [If your arguments did conclude (as they do not) that before Luther's time there was some church of one denomination which was the Catholic Church, I should much rather think it were the church of Greece than the church of Rome; and I believe others also would think so as well as I, but for that reason which one gives, why more men hold the pope above a council, than a council above a pope; that is, because councils give no maintenance or preferment, and the popes do. Chillingworth, *Works*, vol. iii. 289.]

Holy Ghost; and that I had heard say, that even His Majesty should say, That the Greek Church having erred against the Holy Ghost, had lost the Holy Ghost. SECTION IV.

§. You are very bold with His Majesty, to relate him upon hearsay. My intelligence serves me not to tell you what His Majesty said; but if he said it not, you have been too credulous to believe, and too sudden to report it. Princes deserve, and were wont to have, more respect than so. If His Majesty did say it, there is truth in the speech; the error is yours only, by mistaking what is meant by losing the Holy Ghost. For a particular Church may be said to lose the Holy Ghost two ways, or in two degrees. 1. The one, when it loses such special assistance of that blessed Spirit as preserves it from all dangerous errors and sins, and the temporal punishment which is due unto them. And in this sense the Greek Church did perhaps lose the Holy Ghost; for they erred against Him, they sinned against God; and for this, or other sins, they were delivered into another Babylonish captivity under the Turk, in which they yet are, and from which God in His mercy deliver them! But this is rather to be called an error *circa Spiritum Sanctum*, about the doctrine "concerning the Holy Ghost," than an error against the Holy Ghost. 2. The other is, when it loses not only this assistance, but all assistance *ad hoc*, to this, that they may remain any longer a true Church; and so Corinth and Ephesus, and divers other Churches, have lost the Holy Ghost. But in this sense the whole Greek Church lost not the Holy Ghost; for they continue a true Church, in the main substance, to and at this day, though erroneous in this point which you mention, and perhaps in some other too. § 5.

J. The lady's friend, not knowing what to answer, called in the Bishop, who, sitting down first, excused[58] himself as one unprovided, and not much studied in controversies; and desiring that, in case he should fail, yet the Protestant cause might not be thought ill of . . . . .

[58] [The Chaplain taxeth the Jesuit, as if in this parcel he did insult, and saith it was the J.'s modesty to use this excuse, and to say "there were a hundred scholars better than he." But I do not see any insultation, but a simple and true narration of what was said. Neither do I see less modesty in the Jesuit's preferring a thousand before himself, than in the J.'s preferring a hundred before himself.—A. C. marg. note to p. 43.]

[CHAPTER I.]

℟. This is most true; for I did indeed excuse myself, and I had great reason so to do. And my reason being grounded

§ 6. upon modesty for the most part, there I leave it. Yet this it may be fit others should know, that I had no information where the other conferences brake off, no instruction at all what should be the ground of this third conference, nor the full time of four-and-twenty hours to bethink myself. And this I take upon my credit is most true; whereas you make the sifting of these and the like questions to the very bran your daily work, and came thoroughly furnished to the business, and might so lead on the controversy to what yourself pleased, and I was to follow as I could. St. Augustine said once, *Scio me invalidum esse*, "I know I am weak";[59] and yet he made good his cause. And so perhaps may I against you. And in that I preferred the cause before my particular credit, that which I did was with modesty, and according to reason. For there is no reason the weight of this whole cause should rest upon any one particular man; and great reason, that the personal defects of any man should press himself, but not the cause. Neither did I enter upon this service out of any forwardness of my own, but commanded to it by supreme authority.

> ℣. . . . it having an hundred better scholars to maintain it than he. To which I said, There were a thousand better scholars than I to maintain the Catholic cause.

§ 7. ℟. In this I had never so poor a conceit of the Protestants' cause, as to think that they had but an hundred better than myself to maintain it. That which hath an hundred, may have as many more as it pleases God to give, and more than you. And I shall ever be glad that the Church of England, which, at this time, if my memory reflect not amiss, I named, may have far more able defendants than myself. I shall never envy them, but rejoice for her. And I make no question, but that if I had named a thousand, you would have multiplied yours into ten thousand for the Catholic cause, as you call it. And this confidence of yours hath ever been fuller of noise than proof. But you proceed,

> ℣. Then the question about the Greek Church being proposed, I said as before, That it had erred.

[59] *De Util. Credendi*, [*contra Manichæos*,] c. ii. [S. Augustin. *Op.*, tom. viii. col. 48. B. ed. Benedict.]

SECTION VIII.

℣. Then I think the question about the Greek Church was proposed. But after you had, with confidence enough, not spared to say, that what I would not acknowledge in this cause, you would wring and extort from me; then indeed you said as before, that it had erred; and this no man denied. But every error denies not Christ, the foundation; or makes Christ deny it, or thrust it from the foundation.

℟. The ℣. said, that the error was not in point fundamental.

§ 9.

℣. I. I was not so peremptory. My speech was, that divers learned men, and some of your own, were of opinion, that, as the Greeks expressed themselves, it was a question not simply fundamental. I know and acknowledge that error, of denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, to be a grievous error in divinity. And sure, it would have grated the foundation, if they had so denied the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, as that they had made an inequality between the Persons. But since their form of speech is,[60] That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son, and is the Spirit of the Son, without making any difference in the consubstantiality of the Persons; I dare not deny them to be a true Church for this, though I confess them an erroneous Church in this particular.

II. Now that divers learned men were of opinion, that *a Filio et per Filium*, in the sense of the Greek Church, was but a question *in modo loquendi*, "in manner of speech,"[61] and

[60] Non ex Filio esse dicimus: sed Filii Spiritum.—Damascen. lib. i. *Fid. Orth.* c. 11. [p. 272. A. B. ed. Billii.]—Et Patris per Filium.—*Ibid.* [Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς λέγομεν, καὶ πνεῦμα πατρὸς ὀνομάζομεν· ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν· πνεῦμα δὲ υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν· εἴ τις γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, φησὶν ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ· καὶ δι' υἱοῦ πεφανερῶσθαι, καὶ μεταδίδοσθαι ἡμῖν, ὁμολογοῦμεν· But the Holy Spirit we say proceeds from the Father, and we name Him the Spirit of the Father. We do not call Him the Spirit proceeding from the Son, but we name Him the Spirit of the Son; for if any man has not the Spirit of Christ, according to the divine Apostle, he is not Christ's; and we confess that He has been manifested by the Son, and is given to us by the Son.—S. Joann. Damascen. *De Fid. Orthodox.* lib. i. cap. 8. *Op.*, Migne, i. 832-3.]

[61] [Talis autem] pluralitas in voce, salvata unitate in re, non repugnat unitati fidei. [Now such a difference in words, so long as the unity in fact is preserved, is not contrary to the unity of the faith.]—Durand[i *de Sancto Portiano Apostolici quondam penetentiarii, Meldensis ecclesiæ Episcopi, in quatuor Sententiarum libros quæstionum resolutiones*]. Lib. iii. D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] 2. [fol. ccxciii. ed. Paris. 1508.]

[CHAPTER I.]

Gal. iv. [6]. John xvi. [13].

therefore not fundamental, is evident.[62] The master and his scholars agree upon it. "The Greeks," saith he, "confess the Holy Ghost to be the 'Spirit of the Son' (with the Apostle,) and the 'Spirit of truth.' And since *non est aliud*, 'it is not another thing' to say, the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, than that He is or proceeds from the

[62] [Petri Lombard.] Magist[ri Sententiarum,] I. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xi. D. [Peter Lombard was called the Master of the Sentences. He was Bishop of Paris in 1159. His Book was the Manual used by the Schoolmen. He was rigidly logical in his teaching.] —Sane sciendum, quod licet in præsenti articulo a nobis Græci verbo discordent, tamen sensu non differunt. [Confitentur enim Spiritum esse Filii, etsi non a Filio, quia scriptum est, Spiritum Filii. It is plain enough that although in this article now under consideration the Greeks differ from us in expression, none the less they do not differ in meaning. For they admit that He is the Spirit of the Son, although not from the Son, for it is written, the Spirit of the Son.]—Bandinus, lib. i. *de Trin.* d. xi. [*i.e.* Bandini, Theologi doctissimi ac pervetusti, Sententiarum libri quatuor, etc.—lib. i. *de Trinitate*, Dist. xi. p. 54. ed. Lovan. 1557.]—Et Bonaventura, in I. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xi. A[rt.] i. Q[uæst.] i. Sect. xii. [*Op.*, tom. iv. p. 95. A. ed. Mogunt. 1609.], licet Græcis infensissimus, quum dixit Græcos objicere curiositatem Romanis, addendo *Filioque* quia sine hujus Articuli professione salus erat, non respondet negando salutem esse, sed dicit tantum, Opportunam fuisse determinationem propter periculum.—Et postea, [Bonavent.] Sect. xv., et voluerunt isti sustinere opinionem Græcorum, et Latinorum, et distinguunt duplicem modum procedendi. Sed forte si duo sapientes, unus Græcus, [et] alter Latinus, uterque verus amator veritatis, et non propriæ dictionis, de hac visa contrarietate disquirerent, pateret utique tandem ipsam contrarietatem non esse veraciter realem, sicut est vocalis: [alioquin, vel ipsi Græci, vel nos Latini sumus vere hæretici. Sed quis audet hunc auctorem Joannem sc. Damascenum, et Beatos, sc. Basilium, Gregorium Theologum, Gregorium Nazianzenum, Cyrillum, et similes Patres Græcos arguere hæreseos? Although Bonaventura was very angry with the Greeks when he said the Greeks brought against the Romans the charge of being inquisitive in adding the Filioque, because they consider salvation is possible without admitting this Article, still he does not answer by denying they can be saved, but only says that the definition was advisable for fear of danger. And afterwards Sect. xv. he says, "Some wish to uphold the opinion of the Greeks as well as the Latins by making out a double method of procession. But perhaps, if two wise men, one a Greek and the other a Latin, but both real lovers of truth and caring little for their own particular methods of expression, should examine this apparent contradiction, it would after a time become evident that the contradiction was not in facts but in words. Otherwise either Greeks or Latins are heretics. But who would venture to accuse of heresy this writer John Damascene, and the Blessed Saint Basil, Gregory the Theologian, Gregory of Nazianzen, Cyril and suchlike Greek Fathers?"]—Scotus in I. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xi. Q[uæst.] 1. [*Op.*, tom. v. par. i. p. 858. ed. Lugd. 1639.]—Antiquorum apud Græcos auctorum, a Latinis in voce potius, et modo explicandi emanationem Spiritus Sancti est discrepantia, quam in ipsa re. [The difference between the old Greek writers and the Latins is mainly in words, and rather in the way of explaining the emanation of the Holy Spirit, than in any actual doctrine.]—Jodocus Clichtovæus [Neoportiensis, Comment.] in Damasc. *Fid. Orthod.* lib. i. c. 11. [*Op.*, S. Joan. Damasc. p. 274. B. ed. Billii.]—Et quidam eorum dicuntur concedere, quod sit a Filio, vel profluat ab Eo, [non tamen quod procedat. Quod videtur vel ex ig-

Section IX.

Father and the Son, in this they seem to agree with us *in eandem fidei sententiam*, 'upon the same sentence of faith,' though they differ in words." Now in this cause, where the words differ, but "the sentence of faith" is "the same,"[63] *penitus eadem*, "even altogether the same," can the point be fundamental? You may make them no Church, (as Bellarmine[64] doth), and so deny them salvation, which cannot be had out of the true Church: but I for my part dare not so do. And Rome in this particular should be more moderate, if it be but because this article, *Filioque*, was added to the Creed by herself. And it is hard to add and anathematize too.

III. It ought to be no easy thing to condemn a man of heresy in foundation of faith; much less a Church; least of all, so ample and large a Church as the Greek, especially so as to make them no Church. Heaven gates were not so easily shut against multitudes, when St. Peter wore the keys at his own girdle. And it is good counsel which Alphonsus a

norantia vel ex protervia esse. And some of them are said to admit that He is from the Son, or flows forth from the Son, but not that He proceeds: which evidently proves either ignorance or impudence.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] P[ars] i. Q[uæst.] xxxvi. A[rt.] 2. [in conclus. Migne, i. 767.]—Et Thomas ipse dicit, Spiritum Sanctum procedere mediate a Filio, saltem ratione Personarum Spirantium. And Thomas himself says the Holy Ghost proceeds mediately from the Son, at least in the way of Inspiriting Persons.—*Ibid.* A[rt.] 3. [Resp.] ad. 1. Migne, i. 770.—Respondeo [igitur] cum Bessarione et Gennadio, Damascenum non negasse Spiritum Sanctum procedere ex Filio, quod ad rem attinet, cum dixerit, Spiritum esse imaginem Filii, et per Filium [esse]; sed existimasse, tutius dici per Filium, quam ex Filio, quantum ad modum loquendi, [propter hæresim Macedonii, et Eunomii, qui ex Filio, tanquam primaria, immo etiam sola, causa processisse dicebant Spiritum Sanctum. Therefore I answer with Bessarion and Gennadius that Damascene did not deny that the Holy Spirit proceeded out of the Son, which is the point, since he said that the Spirit was the Image of the Son, and came through the Son; but that he thought it safer to say through the Son than out of the Son, using this way of expressing it on account of the heresy of Macedonius and Eunomius who used to say that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son as the primary and indeed the only Cause.]—Bellarm. lib. ii. *de Christo*, c. 27. § *Respondeo igitur.*—Et Tollet. in *S. Joann.* xv. Annot. 25.—Et Lutheran. *Respons. ad Respons. ii. Jeremiæ Patriarchæ.*

[63] Eandem penitus sententiam, etc. —Clichtov. *ubi sup.* [p. 28. note 62.]

[64] Bellarmin. *de Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv. c. 8. Quod autem apud Græcos [non sit Ecclesia, probamus alio modo, quia nimirum convicti sunt legitime in tribus plenariis conciliis. Lateranensi, Lugdunensi et Florentino, de schismate et hæresi, ac præcipue de hæresi circa processionem Spiritus Sancti a Filio, quam esse manifestam hæresim. Lutherani et Calvinistæ etiam confitentur. But that the Greeks have no church we prove in another way, because indeed they were lawfully convicted of schism and heresy in three General Councils, of the Lateran (1215), of Lyons (1245), and of Florence (1438), and chiefly of heresy about the procession of the Spirit from the Son; and that this is an evident heresy even the Lutherans and Calvinists admit.]

[CHAPTER I.]

Castro, one of your own, gives: "Let them consider, that pronounce easily of heresy, how easy it is for themselves to err."[65] Or if you will pronounce, consider what it is that separates from the Church simply, and not in part only. I must needs profess, that I wish heartily, as well as others,[66] that those distressed men, whose cross is heavy already, had been more plainly and moderately dealt withal, though they think a diverse thing from us, than they have been by the Church of Rome. But hereupon you say you were "forced,"

> ff. Whereupon I was forced to repeat what I had formerly brought against Dr. White concerning points fundamental, [first reading the sentence of St. Augustine, *Ferendus est disputator errans*, etc., out of which is proved that all points defined by the Church are fundamental].

[65] Lib. iii. *cont. Hæreses*, in verbo *Beatitudo*. [Secund. Hæres.] fol. 93. A. [In hac parte sunt secuti, eadem ratione dicentur hæretici. Hæc omnia in medium placuit adferre,] ut videant hi, qui facile de hæresi pronuntiant, quam facile etiam ipsi errent: et intelligant, non esse tam leviter de hæresi censendum. [In this matter they have been prosecuted; on the same ground they will be pronounced heretics. It was important to make this clear in order that the men who talk so glibly about heresy may see how easily they themselves may fall into error; and may understand that declarations about heresy must not be lightly framed.]

[66] [J]unius, *Animad*[*versiones*] *in Bel-lar*[*min.*] *Controv.* ii. lib. ii. [de Christo,] cap. 23. [1. Art. 10. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 564. ed. Genev. 1613.]

[CHAPTER II.

What are the Fundamentals of the Faith?

Before we enter on the somewhat dreary discussion as to what is fundamental, we may reasonably pause a moment over the Bishop's chivalrous defence of the Eastern Church. The Patriarch of Constantinople, the chief bishop of this Church, was well known to Laud by the reports of Englishmen from that great capital, once the centre of Christianity, but nearly 200 years before this controversy become the prey of the Turk. The friendship between the English and the Greeks bore its fruit in the Greek gift of the Alexandrine MS. of the Bible (Codex A) to the English kings. The interest aroused by news of the condition of the scattered and oppressed communities in the farther East, stimulated that study of Eastern languages at Oxford of which Laud, the founder of the Arabic Professorship, became the most prominent patron; and the magnificent English Polyglot Bible was the result of the spirit of study which he fostered. The existence of the Eastern Churches, immemorially free from Rome, was in itself a very striking defence of the Anglican position.

But the question of fundamentals, which this divergence of views on the orthodoxy of the Greek Church brought forward, was an essential point in the defence of the English Church. If the later Roman controversialists were right, and everything decreed by the Pope was fundamental, the free spirit, which had founded the English Church, using the old and using the new, stood condemned. Thus it was most important to Laud to show that the English position had the approval of the early Christian Fathers. A large part of this second chapter, i.e. all that part which is in answer to A. C., did not come into the spoken controversy at all, but was added in the edition of 1639, by Laud, then Archbishop of Canterbury, in order to strengthen his arguments.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

Laud at once takes the position that not all points defined by the Church are fundamental. He shows his intense dislike for heaping

[CHAPTER II.] *up obligatory articles of faith and fettering the freedom of Christian thought. He therefore distinguishes between the Church in general, which cannot err, and a General Council, which is only representative, and as such cannot contain the whole wisdom of the Church. Further, the Church, he says, (and of course the Church can only speak through Councils) may not create a new article of faith, nor make anything fundamental which is not such intrinsically and in its own nature. He denies that Augustine, in a passage which Fisher depends upon to prove his contention, means that everything defined by the Church is fundamental; and he maintains that among the decisions of the Church some are more, some are less authoritative. For fundamentals he turns to the Creed. Fisher catches at this as an admission, and impugns English orthodoxy on the ground that English doctors differ about "the Descent into Hell." Laud shows that the Roman doctors also differ on the exact meaning of this article, and go much further than the English, since some of them maintain that the article cannot be proved by Scripture at all. The opinions of private authors, he insists, must not be quoted as the authoritative decisions of the Church, on either side. The passage ends with a triumphant contrast between the freedom allowed by the English and the narrowness practised and adopted by the Romans.*]

§ 10. **R.** I. Hereupon it is true, that you read a large discourse out of a book printed, which you said was yours; the particulars, all of them at the least, I do not now remember, nor did I then approve. But if they be such as were formerly brought against Doctor White, they are by him formerly answered. The first thing you did was the righting[1] of St. Augustine: which sentence I do not at all remember was so much as named in the conference, much less was it stood upon, and then righted by you. Another place of St. Augustine indeed was (which you omit); but it comes after, about tradition, to which I remit it. But now you tell us of a great proof made out of this place:[2] for these words of yours contain two propositions: One, "that all points defined by the Church are fundamen-

[1] "First righting the sentence of St. Augustine, *Ferendus est disputator errans*, etc." [An erring disputor must be borne with.] Here A. C. p. 44, tells us very learnedly, that my corrupt copy hath *righting* instead of *reading* the sentence of St. Augustine. Whereas I here use the word *righting*, not as it is opposed to *reading*, (as any man may discern A. C. palpably mistakes,) but for *doing right* to St. Augustine; and if I had meant it for *writing* I should not have spelled it so.

[Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, died 430. His works are the great storehouse for quotation in this Conference.]

[2] "By which is proved, that all points defined by the Church are fundamental."—[A. C. p. 44.]

tal"; the other, "that this is proved out of this place of St. Augustine."

II. 1. For the first, "that all points defined by the Church are fundamental." It was not the least means by which Rome grew to her greatness, to blast every opposer she had with the name of heretic, or schismatic; for this served to shrivel the credit of the persons; and the persons once brought into contempt and ignominy, all the good they desired in the Church fell to dust, for want of creditable persons to back and support it. To make this proceeding good in these later years, this course, it seems, was taken. The school, that must maintain, (and so they do,) "that all points defined by the Church are thereby fundamental,[8] necessary to be believed,[4] of the substance of the faith,[5] and that, though it be determined quite *extra Scripturam*."[6] And then leave the wise and active heads to take order,[7] that there be strength enough ready to determine what is fittest for them.

III. But since these men distinguish not, nor you, between

[3] Your own word.

[4] Inconcussa fide ab omnibus.—[By every one with an unshaken faith.] Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] i. Art[ic.] 10. C[onclusio . . . Migne, iii. 26.]

[5] Scotus [in] I. *Sentent.* D[istinct.]. xi. Q[uæst.] 1. [*Op.*, tom. v. par. 1. p. 858.]

[6] [Nam] ecclesiasticas voces, etiam extra Scripturas, [iidem illi Sancti Patres studiosissime receperunt. The words of the Church, even outside the Scripture, were most affectionately accepted by those same Holy Fathers.] —Stapleton, [*Relectio Scholastica principiorum fidei doctrinalium per controversias, quæstiones et articulos tradita*;] Controv. [Capitalis,] iv. [*De Potest. Eccl.*] Quæst. i. Art. 3. [solut. argumentorum, *Op.*, tom. i. p. 743. D. ed. Paris. 1620.]—[Sed] quæ [Ecclesia ab Apostolorum usque temporibus firma et certa traditione accepit, vel contra hæreses in causa fidei] maturo judicio definivit, . . . etiam si nullo Scripturarum, aut evidenti, aut probabili, testimonio confirmetur, solidum tamen [et indubitatum cuivis fideli et vero Ecclesiæ filio esse debet. But those (doctrines) which the Church has accepted by a sure and certain tradition from the very times of the Apostles, or has defined after mature decision in support of the faith against heretics, even if they are confirmed by no evidence from Scripture either plain and clear or even probable, ought to be treated as irrefragable and indubitable by every faithful and true son of the Church.]—*Ibid.* [p. 744. A.]

[7] Et penes Cercopes victoria sit. [And the victory must be left in the hands of the Cercopes.]—Greg. Nazian. *de Differen. Vitæ.* [Carm. xvii. (al. x.) l. 101. de diversis vitæ generibus, et adversus falsos episcopos. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 854. ed. Benedict. 1840. et tom. ii. p. 81. B. ed. Paris. 1630.

Ταῦτα μὲν, οἷσι φίλον, καὶ κερκώπων κράτος εἴη·
Αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ πλήσομαι ἀτρεμέων.]

—Cercopes vocat astutos et veteratoriæ [cujusdam] improbitatis Episcopos, qui artibus suis ac dolis concilia omnia perturbabant.—Schol. *ibid.* [These Cercopes were fabled to be a mischievous and monkey-like set of men. Hence all mischief-makers got this name. Gregory uses it of mischief-making Bishops at the Councils of the Church. These he calls Cercopes are Bishops astute in character and of long standing in intrigue who were accustomed to disturb every Council by their arts and wiles.]

[CHAPTER II.]

the Church in general and a General Council, which is but her representation for determinations of the faith; though I be very slow in sifting or opposing what is concluded by lawful, general, and consenting authority; though I give as much as can justly be given to the definitions of Councils truly general; nay, suppose I should grant, which I do not, that General Councils cannot err; yet this cannot down with me, that all points even so defined are fundamental. For deductions are not prime, and native principles; nor are superstructures foundations. That which is a foundation for all, cannot be one and another to different Christians in regard of itself; for then it could be no common rule for any, nor could the souls of men rest upon a shaking foundation. No: if it be a true foundation, it must be common to all, and firm under all; in which sense the Articles of Christian Faith are fundamental. And Irenæus[8] lays this for a ground, that the whole Church, howsoever dispersed in place, speaks this with one mouth: "He, which among the guides of the Church is best able to speak, utters no more than this; and less than this, the most simple doth not utter." Therefore the creed, of which he speaks, is a common, is a constant foundation. And an explicit faith must be of this, in them which have the use of reason; for both guides and simple people, all the Church, utter this.

IV. Now many things are defined by the Church, which are but deductions out of this: which, suppose them deduced right, move far from the foundation—without which deductions explicitly believed, many millions of Christians go to heaven—and cannot therefore be fundamental in the faith. True deductions from the article may require necessary belief, in them which are able, and do go along with them from the principle to the conclusion. But I do not see, either that the learned do make them necessary to all, or any reason why they should. Therefore they cannot be fundamental; and yet to some men's salvation they are necessary.

[8] Quum enim una et eadem fides sit, neque is qui multum de ipsa dicere potest, plusquam oportet, dicet; neque qui parum, ipsam imminuit.—Iren. lib. i. *Advers. Hæres.* c. 3. [*μιᾶς γὰρ καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως οὔσης, οὔτε ὁ πολὺ περὶ αὐτῆς δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν, ἐπλεόνασεν, οὔτε ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον, ἠλαττόνησε.* For since the faith is one and the same, neither he who can speak much about it, has increased it, nor has he who can speak little about it diminished it.—Iren. *contra Hæreses*, lib. i. cap. 3. (al. x. 2.) in fin. pp. 47, 47. ed. Grabe. Oxon. 1702. Migne, vii. 553.]

V. Besides, that which is fundamental in the faith of Christ is a rock immovable, and can never be varied; never.[9] Therefore, if it be fundamental after the Church hath defined it, it was fundamental before the definition; else it is movable: and then no Christian hath where to rest. And if it be immovable,[10] as indeed it is, no decree of a council, be it never so general, can alter immovable verities no more than it can change immovable natures. Therefore if the Church in a council define anything, the thing defined is not fundamental because the Church hath defined it; nor can be made so by the definition of the Church, if it be not so in itself. For if the Church had this power, she might make a new article of the faith, which the learned among yourselves deny:[11] for the articles of the faith cannot increase in substance, but only in explication.[12] And for this, I will

[9] Resolutio Occhami est, quod nec tota ecclesia, nec concilium generale, nec summus pontifex potest facere articulum, quod non fuit articulus. Sed in dubiis propositionibus potest ecclesia determinare, an sint catholicæ, etc. Tamen sic determinando non facit quod sint catholicæ, quum prius essent ante ecclesiæ determinationem, etc. [Ockham's conclusion is that neither the whole Church, nor a General Council, nor the Chief Pontiff, can make into an article of faith that which was no article of faith. But in the case of doubtful propositions, the Church can settle whether they are Catholic, yet in so settling about them does not make them Catholic; since they were Catholic before the decision of the Church.] —[Magistri Jacobi] Almain. in III. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] 1. [Conclus. 7. fol. lxxx. ed. Lugd. 1527.] —[William of Ockham, an Englishman, who belonged to Merton College, Oxford, was a Franciscan, and a very pious Schoolman. He wrote strongly against Pope John XXII. in 1323.]

[10] Regula [quidem] Fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis, et irreformabilis. [There is one distinct rule of faith, the only one, unchangeable, unalterable.]—Tertul. *de Virg. vel.* cap. i. [p. 173. A. Migne, ii. 889.] In hac fide, etc. Nihil transmutare, etc. —Athan. *Epist. ad Jovian. de fide.* Ταύτῃ τῇ πίστει, Αὔγουστε, πάντας ἐπιμένειν ἀναγκαῖον, ὡς θείᾳ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ, καὶ μηδένα μετάκινειν αὐτὴν πιθανολογίαις καὶ λογομαχίαις, ὅπερ πεποιήκασιν οἱ Ἀρειομανῖται· κ.τ.λ. In this faith, Augustus, we must all abide, for it is divine and apostolic, and no one must alter it by cunning tricks and sleight of words, as the Arius-maniacs have done.--Sect. iv. *Op.*, tom. i. pars ii. p. 782. A. ed. Benedict.]

[11] Occham. [as quoted by] Almain. in III. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] 1. [Sed utrum ecclesia possit facere articulum novum quod tangit Ocham in secundo libro dialogi in prima parte, dicit resolutorie, quod nec ecclesia nec papa potest facere novum articulum. But whether the Church can make a new article of faith is a point which Ockham treats in the second book of the dialogue and the first part; and he says decidedly that neither Church nor Pope can make a new article of faith.—*Ibid.* paulo supra.]

[12] Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Quæst. i. Art. 7. C[onclus. Migne, iii. 20. Dicendum est, quod quantum ad substantiam articulorum fidei, non est factum eorum augmentum per temporum successionem, quia quæcunque posteriores crediderunt, continebantur in fide præcedentium patrum, licet implicite. Sed quantum ad explicationem crevit numerus articulorum; quia quædam explicite

[CHAPTER II.]

be judged by Bellarmine,[13] who, disputing against Amb[rosius] Catharinus, about the certainty of faith, tells us, "that divine faith hath not its certainty because it is Catholic, *i.e.* common to the whole Church, but because it builds on the authority of God, Who is truth itself, and can neither deceive nor be deceived." And he adds, "that the probation of the Church can make it known to all, that the object of divine faith is revealed from God, and therefore certain, and not to be doubted; but the Church can add no certainty, no firmness to the word of God revealing it."

VI. Nor is this hard to be further proved out of your own school; for Scotus[14] professeth it in this very particular of the Greek Church:[15] "If there be," saith he, "a true real difference between the Greeks and the Latins, about the point of the procession of the Holy Ghost, then either they or we be *vere hæretici*, truly and indeed heretics." And he speaks this of the old Greeks, long before any decision of the Church in this controversy: for his instance is in St. Basil,[16] and Greg[ory] Nazianz[en] on the one side, and St. Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose,[17] on the other. "And who dares call any of these

cognita sunt a posterioribus, quæ a prioribus non cognoscebantur explicite. We ought to say that with regard to the substance of the articles of faith, the advance of time makes no increase in them, because whatever the later authorities believed, were contained in the faith of those fathers who went before them, though implicitly. But as for the explanation, the number of articles has grown; for several are known explicitly to the latter generations which were not known explicitly to the earlier.]

[13] Fides divina . . . Non ideo certitudinem habet quia toti Ecclesiæ communis est, sed quia nititur auctoritate Dei, qui nec falli, nec fallere, potest, cum sit ipsa veritas. [The divine faith does not derive its certainty from the fact that it is common to the whole Church, but from the fact that it rests on the authority of God, Who can neither be deceived nor deceive any one, because He is very truth.]—[Bellarmin.] *de Justif.* lib. iii. c. 3. [*Op.*, tom. iv. col. 951. A. B.]—Probatio Ecclesiæ facit, ut omnibus innotescat, objectum illud (sc. fidei divinæ) esse revelatum a Deo, et propter hoc certum et indubitatum; non autem tribuit firmitatem verbo Dei aliquid revelantis. [The effect of the approval of the Church is that every one shall know that the particular matter of divine faith in question has been revealed by God, and therefore is sure and indisputable; for it does not add any value to the Word of God when He reveals something.] —*Ibid.*

[14] [Duns Scotus, an Englishman, was one of the most celebrated schoolmen. He is said to have gathered 30,000 students round him in Oxford. Dean Milman says of him: "Logic was the idol of Duns, and this logic worship is the key to his whole philosophy." His system was the rival to Aquinas'. He died in 1308.]

[15] Scotus in I. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xi. Q[uæst.] 1.

[16] [St. Basil was Archbishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia: the great theologian, preacher, and philanthropist of the time. Born in 330, died in 379.]

[17] [St. Ambrose was Archbishop of Milan, and had been, before that, Governor of North Italy; lived 340 to 397.]

heretics?" is his challenge. I deny not, but that Scotus adds there, that howsoever this was before, yet *ex quo*, from the time that the Catholic Church declared it, it is to be held as of the substance of the faith. But this cannot stand with his former principle, if he intend by it, that whatsoever the Church defines, shall be *ipso facto*, and for that determination's sake, fundamental. For if before the determination, supposing the difference real, some of those worthies were truly heretics, as he confesses, then somewhat made them so. And that could not be the decree of the Church, which then was not. Therefore it must be somewhat really false, that made them so; and fundamentally false, if it made them heretics against the foundation. But Scotus was wiser than to intend this. It may be, he saw the stream too strong for him to swim against, therefore he went on with the doctrine of the time, That the Church's sentence is of the substance of faith; but meant not to betray the truth. For he goes no further than *ecclesia declaravit*, "since the Church hath declared it," which is the word that is used by divers.[18]

VII. Now the master[19] teaches, and the scholars[20] too, that everything which belongs to the exposition or declaration of another, *intus est*, is not another contrary thing, but is contained within the bowels and nature of that which is interpreted; from which if the declaration depart, it is faulty and erroneous, because, instead of declaring, it gives another and contrary sense.[21]

[18] Bellarm. *de Concil. auctoritat.* lib. ii. cap. 12. Concilia cum definiunt, [qui sint libri canonici et divini,] non faciunt eos esse infallibilis veritatis, sed *declarant* [solum esse tales. When Councils give definitions as to what books are canonical and divine, they do not make the books infallibly true, but make public the fact that they are so.—Hæretici multa quæ erant implicita fidei nostræ, sua importunitate compulerunt] *explicare.* [Heretics have compelled the Church to explain many implicit articles of faith by the trouble they have given.] —Bonavent. in I. [*Sentent.*] Distinct. xi. Art. 1. Quæst. 1. [in conclus. ad vi. *Op.*, tom. iv. p. 95. E. ed. Mogunt. 1689.]—*Explanabatur* . . . *declarantes.*— Thom. [Aquin.] 1. [*Summ.*] Quæst. xxxvi. Art. 2. in Conclus. Respons. ad 2. [Migne, i. 767.] Et, . . . *explicatio.*—Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Quæst. i. Art. 10. in Conclus. Respons. ad 1. [Migne, iii. 27.]—Quid unquam aliud (Ecclesia) Conciliorum decretis enisa est, nisi ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur, hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur? [What else has the Church ever attempted by the decrees of Councils but this? viz.: that what was believed simply before is to be believed more thoroughly for the future.]—Vin. Lir. *cont. Hær.* c. xxxii. [p. 71. ed. Colon. 1585.]

[19] [Petr. Lomb.] *Sent.* I. D[istinct.] xi. [Cap. 2. Migne.]

[20] Alb. Magn. in I. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xi. Art. 7.

[21] Hoc [inquam,] semper, nec quicquam præterea. [This I say always; and besides this nothing.]—Vin. Lir. c. xxxii.

[CHAPTER II.] Therefore, when the Church declares anything in a Council, either that which she declares was *intus*, or *extra*—in the nature and verity of the thing, or out of it. If it were *extra*, without the nature of the thing declared, then the declaration of the thing is false, and so, far from being fundamental in the faith.[22] If it were *intus*, within the compass and nature of the thing, though not open and apparent to every eye, then the declaration is true, but not otherwise fundamental than the thing is which is declared: for that which is *intus*, cannot be larger or deeper than that in which it is; if it were, it could not be *intus*. Therefore nothing is simply fundamental because the Church declares it, but because it is so in the nature of the thing which the Church declares.

VIII. And it is a slight and poor evasion that is commonly used, that the declaration of the Church makes it fundamental *quoad nos*, "in respect of us"; for it doth not that neither: for no respect to us can vary the foundation. The Church's declaration can bind us to peace and external obedience, where there is not express letter of Scripture and sense agreed on; but it cannot make anything fundamental to us, that is not so in its own nature. For if the Church can so add, that it can by a declaration make a thing to be fundamental in the faith, that was not; then it can take a thing away from the foundation,

[22] In nova hæresi veritas prius erat de fide, etsi non ita declarata.—[In the case of every new heresy the true doctrine was already a matter of faith, though not publicly declared.]—[Joannes Duns] Scotus, [Doctor Subtil.] in I. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct.] xi. Q[uæst.] i. in fine. Hæretici multa quæ erant implicita fidei nostræ, compulerunt explicare. [The heretics compelled the Church to explain many things which were already implicitly taught in the faith.] Bonavent. in I. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct.] xi. A[rt.] 1. Q[uæst.] 1. [in conclus. ad. vi.] ad finem. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] i. Q[uæst.] xxxvi. A[rt.] 2. [Resp.] ad 2. [Migne, i. 767.] [Admonere tamen hic oportet, quod] quamvis Apostolica sedes, aut generale concilium de hæresi censere possit, non tamen ideo assertio aliqua erit hæresis, quia Ecclesia definivit, sed quia fidei Catholicæ repugnat. Ecclesia siquidem sua definitione non facit talem assertionem esse hæresim, quum, etiamsi ipsa non definivisset, esset hæresis; sed id efficit [ecclesia] ut [nobis per suam censuram] pateat, [illud esse hæresim, quod contra nos latebat an merito hæresis dici posset.—Here, however, I must point out that although the Apostolic See or a General Council can give a decision on a question of heresy, it does not become a heresy because the Church has defined it, but is a heresy because it is contrary to the Catholic faith. So the Church does not make the assertion heretical by its definition; because it was already a heresy even if the Church had given no definition. This is what the Church does; by its decision it makes us detect the heresy, about which we were in danger of not knowing whether it were actually a heresy.]—Alphon. a Castro. I[ib.] i. *Advers. Hæres.* c. viii. fol. 21. D. [*Op.*, col. 49. E.]

and make it, by declaring, not to be fundamental; which all men grant, no power of the Church can do.[23] "For the power of adding anything contrary, and of detracting anything necessary, are alike forbidden,"[24] and alike denied. Now, nothing is more apparent than this to the eye of all men: That the Church of Rome hath determined, or declared, or defined (call it what you will), very many things, that are not in their own nature fundamental; and therefore neither are, nor can be, made so by her adjudging them. Now to all this discourse, That the Church hath not power to make anything fundamental in the faith, that intrinsically and in its own nature is not such, A. C. is content to say nothing.

SECTION X.

Deut. iv. 2.

IX. 2. For the second, That it is proved by this place of St. Augustine, "That all points defined by the Church are fundamental." You might have given me that place cited in the margin, and eased my pains to seek it; but it may be there was somewhat in concealing it. For you do so extraordinarily "right this place," that you were loth (I think) anybody should see how you wrong it. The place of St. Augustine is this, against the Pelagians, about remission of original sin in infants:[25] "This is a thing founded: an erring disputer

[23] Ecclesia non amputat necessaria, non apponit superflua.—[The Church cuts off nothing which is necessary; it adds nothing which is superfluous.] —Vin. Lir. c. xxxii. [p. 71.]

[24] [Ministri Ecclesiæ instituuntur in Ecclesia divinitus fundata et ideo institutio Ecclesiæ præsupponitur ad operationem ministrorum . . . ideo ad ministros Ecclesiæ novos articulos fidei edere, aut editos removere, aut nova sacramenta instituere, aut instituta removere non pertinet, sed hoc est potestatis excellentis quæ soli debetur Christo, qui est Ecclesiæ fundamentum.—The ministers of the Church are appointed in a Church which has been founded by God, and therefore in every act of its ministers the appointment of the Church is presupposed . . . therefore it is no business of the Church's ministers to publish new articles or to remove those that are published or to appoint new sacraments; but this is the part of that supereminent power which belongs to Christ alone, to Christ Who is the foundation of the Church.]—Thom. [Aquin.] Supp. [Tert. part. *Summ.*] Q[uæst.] vi. A[rt.] 6. C. [*Op.*, tom. ix. Migne, iv. 939.]

[25] Augustin. *Serm.* xiv. *de Verb. Apost.* c. 21. [*Serm.* ccxciv. *de Baptism. Parvul.* cap. 21. (20.) in fin. *Op.*, tom. v. col. 1193. F. ed. Ben. Migne, v. 1348. Ut amici exhortamur, non ut inimici litigamus. Detrahunt nobis, ferimus: canoni non detrahant, veritati non detrahant, Ecclesiæ Sanctæ pro remissione peccati originalis parvulorum quotidie laboranti non contradicant.] Fundata [ista] res est. Ferendus est disputator errans in aliis quæstionibus non diligenter digestis, nondum plena Ecclesiæ authoritate firmatis; ibi ferendus est error; non tantum progredi debet, ut etiam fundamentum ipsum Ecclesiæ quatere moliatur.—[We are friends and therefore exhort them, we are not enemies who have come to plead against them. They take away our character, we endure; but they must not take away from the Canon, nor take away from the truth, nor must they attack the Holy

[CHAPTER II.] is to be borne with in other questions not diligently digested, not yet made firm by full authority of the Church; their error is to be borne with; but it ought not to go so far that it should labour to shake the foundation itself of the Church." This is the place; but it can never follow out of this place, I think, that everything defined by the Church is fundamental.

X. For, first, he speaks of a "foundation of doctrine in Scripture," not "a Church definition." This appears: for, few lines before, he tells us,[26] "There was a question moved to St. Cyprian, whether baptism was concluded to the eighth day, as well as circumcision? And no doubt was made then of the beginning of sin (*origine peccati*), and that out of this thing, about which no question was moved (*ex ea re, unde nulla erat quæstio, soluta est exorta quæstio*), that question that was made was answered." And again, "That St. Cyprian took that which he gave in answer from the foundation of the Church, to confirm a stone that was shaking (*Hoc de fundamento Ecclesiæ sumpsit ad confirmandum lapidem nutantem*)." Now St. Cyprian, in all the answer that he gives,[27] hath not one word of any definition of the Church: therefore *ea res*, "that thing" by which he answered, was a foundation of prime and settled Scripture doctrine, not any definition of the Church: therefore, that which he took out of the foundation of the Church, to fasten the stone that shook, was not a definition of the Church, but the foundation of the Church itself, the Scripture upon which it is builded: as appeareth in the Milevitane Council;[28] where
Rom. v. 15. the rule, by which Pelagius[29] was condemned, is the rule of

Church while it labours every day to win forgiveness of original sin for little children. That is part of the Church's foundation. An opponent must be endured when he makes a mistake in matters not thoroughly examined, and not yet confirmed by the full authority of the Church; so far a mistake can be endured; but he must not go so far as to try to shake the very foundations of the Church.]

[26] *Ibid.* cap. 20. [Migne, v. 1347.]

[27] S. Cyprian. *Ep.* lix. *ad Fidum, de Infant Bapt. Op.*, p. 99. ed. Benedict.

[28] [The Council of Milevis in Africa was held in 416. Augustine was present. It condemned Pelagius.]

[29] Concil. Milevitan. C[anon.] ii. [Item placuit, ut quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, aut dicit, in remissionem quidem peccatorum nos baptizari, sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati, quod regenerationis lavacro expietur: unde fit consequens, ut in eis forma baptismatis in remissionem peccatorum, non vere, sed false, intelligatur, anathema sit. Quoniam non aliter intelligendum est, quod ait apostolus (Rom. v. 18.) *Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt*, nisi quemadmodum ecclesia catholica ubique diffusa semper intellexit. Propter hanc enim regulam fidei, etiam parvuli, qui nihil peccatorum in semetipsis adhuc committere

Scripture; therefore St. Augustine goes on in the same sense, that "the disputer is not to be borne any longer, that shall endeavour to shake the foundation itself, upon which the whole Church is grounded" (*ut fundamentum ipsum Ecclesiæ quatere moliatur*). SECTION X.

XI. Secondly, if St. Augustine did mean by "founded," and "foundation," the definition of the Church, because of these words, "This thing is founded; this is made firm by full authority of the Church"; and the words following these, "to shake the foundation of the Church"; yet it can never follow, out of any or all these circumstances (and these are all), that all points defined by the Church are fundamental in the faith. For, first, no man denies but the Church is a foundation; that things defined by it, are founded upon it: and yet hence it cannot follow, that the thing that is so founded is fundamental in the faith: for things may be founded upon human authority,[30] and be very certain, yet not fundamental in the faith. Nor yet can it follow, This thing is founded: therefore everything determined by the Church is founded: Again: that which follows, That those things are not to be opposed which are made firm by full authority of the Church, cannot conclude they are therefore fundamental in the faith. For full Church authority (always the time that included the holy Apostles being passed by, and not comprehended in it) is but Church authority; and Church authority when it is at full sea, is not simply divine,[31] therefore

1 Tim. iii. 15.

potuerunt, ideo in peccatorum remissionem veraciter baptizantur, ut in eis regeneratione mundetur, quod generatione traxerunt.—[It was also decided that whoever should deny that a new born infant ought to be baptized, should be anathema, or any who says that we are indeed baptized for the remission of sins, but that we derive no original sin from Adam, which has to be washed away in the bath of regeneration—for the consequence of this would be, that they do not understand rightly but misunderstand the form of baptism for remission of sin. For the saying of the Apostle, "By one man sin came into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned," is to be understood as it always has been understood by the universal Church throughout the world. For it is because of this rule of faith that our little children, who have never been able to commit sin in themselves, are truly baptized for the remission of sins, so that in them the new and spiritual birth may cleanse away the impurity which the old and physical birth brought upon them.—Concil. tom. ii. col. 1538. C.]

[30] Mos fundatissimus.—S. Aug. *Ep.* 28. [A most well-founded custom.] liber *ad Hieronym. seu Epist.* clxvi. (al. xxviii.) cap. 8. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 593. B. ed. Benedict. Migne, ii. 731.]

[31] Stapleton, *Relect. Controv.* iv. [de potestate ecclesiæ in se], Q[uæst.] iii. [An vox. determinantis Ecclesiæ sit divina?] A[rtic.] 1. [Vox et determinatio ecclesiæ est *suo modo* divina. The voice and decision of the Church is in its own degree divine.—*Op.*, tom. i. p. 750. Cf. note 62.]

[CHAPTER II.] the sentence of it not fundamental in the faith. And yet no erring disputer may be endured to shake the foundation which the Church in council lays. But plain Scripture with evident sense, or a full demonstrative argument, must have room, where a wrangling and erring disputer may not be allowed it. And there is neither of these, but may convince the definition of the Council[32] if it be ill founded. And the articles of the faith may easily prove it is not fundamental, if indeed and verily it be not so.

XII. And I have read somebody that says (is it not you?) "that things are fundamental in the faith two ways": one in their matter—such as are all things which be so in themselves; the other, in the manner—such as are all things that the Church hath defined and determined to be of faith: and that so, some things that are *de modo*, "of the manner of being, are of faith." But in plain truth, this is no more than if you should say, some things are fundamental in the faith, and some are not. For, wrangle while you will, you shall never be able to prove that anything which is but *de modo*, a consideration "of the manner of being" only, can possibly be fundamental in the faith.

XIII. And since you make such a foundation of this place, I will a little view the mortar with which it is laid by you. It is a venture but I shall find it "untempered." Your assertion is: "All points defined by the Church are fundamental." Your proof, this place: "Because that is not to be shaken, which is settled by full authority of the Church (*plena ecclesiæ*

[32] Quæ quidem, si tam manifesta monstratur, ut in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus, quibus in Catholica teneor. [If the truth indeed is shown so clearly that it cannot be doubted, it must be preferred to all those things which bind my affections to the Catholic Church.]—S. Aug. *contra.* [*Epistolam Manichæi, quam vocant*] *Fund*[*amenti,*] cap. iv. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 153. D. ed. Benedict.—Quod] si [forte] in Evangelio aliquid apertissimum [de Manichæi apostolatu invenire potueris, infirmabis mihi Catholicorum auctoritatem, qui jubent ut tibi non credam; qua infirmata, jam nec evangelio credere potero, quia per eos illi credideram; ita nihil apud me valebit, quidquid inde protuleris. Quapropter si nihil manifestum de Manichæi apostolatu in Evangelio reperitur, Catholicis potius credam quam tibi. But if it should happen that you had found in the Gospel some quite clear evidence about the Apostolic authority of Manichæus you would overthrow in my mind the authority of the Catholics who command me not to believe you. But when their authority had been overthrown, I should no longer be able to believe the Gospel, because I have believed it on their testimony, and then nothing would have any influence with me which you produced from the Gospel. Therefore, if there is no distinct evidence found in the Gospel about this Apostolic authority of Manichæus, I shall believe the Catholics rather than believe you.—*Ibid.* cap. v. col. 154. C.]

authoritate)." Then it seems your meaning is, that this point there spoken of, "The remission of original sin in baptism of infants," was defined, when St. Augustine wrote this, by a full sentence of a General Council. First, if you say it was, Bellarmine will tell you it is false; and that the Pelagian heresy was never condemned in an œcumenical council,[33] but only in nationals. But Bellarmine is deceived: for while the Pelagians stood out impudently against national councils, some of them defended Nestorius,[34] which gave occasion to the first Ephesine Council to excommunicate and depose them.[35] And yet this will not serve your turn for this place. For St. Augustine was then dead; and therefore could not mean the sentence of that Council in this place. Secondly, if you say it was not then defined in an œcumenical synod; *plena authoritas ecclesiæ*, "the full authority of the Church," there mentioned, doth not stand properly for the decree of an œcumenical council, but for some national; as this was condemned in a national council:[36] and then the full authority of the Church here, is no more than the full authority of this Church of Africa.[37] And I hope that authority doth not make all points defined by it to be fundamental. You will say, yes, if that council be confirmed by the Pope. And then I must ever wonder why St. Augustine should say, "the full authority of the Church"; and not bestow one word upon the Pope, by whose authority only that Council, as all others, have their fulness of authority, in your judgment. An inexpiable omission, if this doctrine concerning the Pope were true.

SECTION X.

[the Church . . . Editt. 1673 and 1686.]

XIV. But here A. C. steps in again to help the Jesuit, and he tells us, over and over again, "that all points made firm by full authority of the Church, are fundamental"; so, "firm" he will have them, and therefore "fundamental." But I must tell him, that first, it is one thing in nature, and religion too, to be firm, and another thing to be fundamental. These two are not convertible: it is true that everything that is fundamental

A. C. p. 45.

[33] Lib. ii. *de Concil. Auctorit.* cap. v. [Plurimæ hæreses quæ damnatæ sunt] a solis [conciliis] particularibus. [Very many heresies were condemned only by national Councils, . . . as the heresy of Pelagius, etc.—Bellarmin. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 59. B.]

[34] [Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople in 428, was deposed by Council of Ephesus in 431, for heresy on the nature of Christ. He died *circa* 439.]

[35] Can. i. and iv.

[36] Concil. Milevit. Can. ii. [*ubi sup.* note 28.]

[37] Nay, if your own Cappellus be true.—*De Appell. Eccl. Afric.* c. ii. n. 5,—it was but a provincial of Numidia, not a plenary of Africa.

[CHAPTER II.] is firm; but it doth not follow that everything that is firm is fundamental. For many a superstructure is exceeding firm, being fast and close joined to a sure foundation, which yet no man will grant is fundamental. Besides, whatsoever is fundamental in the faith is fundamental to the Church, which is "one by the unity of faith."[38] Therefore, if everything defined by the Church be fundamental in the faith, then the Church's definition is the Church's foundation. And so, upon the matter, the Church can lay her own foundation; and then the Church must be in absolute and perfect being before so much as her foundation is laid. Now this is so absurd for any man of learning to say, that by and by after A. C. is content to affirm not only that the *prima credibilia*, the articles of faith, but "all which so pertains to supernatural, divine, and infallible Christian faith, as that thereby Christ doth dwell in our hearts, etc., is the foundation of the Church under Christ the prime foundation." And here he is out again. For, first, all which pertains to supernatural, divine, and infallible Christian faith, is not by and by fundamental in the faith to all men.[39] And secondly, the whole discourse here is concerning faith, as it is taken *objective*, for the object of faith and thing to be believed; but that faith by which Christ is said to dwell in our hearts is taken *subjective*, for the habit and act of faith. Now to confound both these in one period of speech, can have no other

[38] Almain. in III. *Sent.* Distinct. xxv. Quæst. 1. [Concl. 3. fol. lxxix. ed. Lugd. 1527.] A fide enim una Ecclesia dicitur una. [For from having one faith the Church is called one Church.]

[39] Ad fidem pertinet aliquid dupliciter. Uno modo *directe*, sicut ea quæ nobis sunt principaliter divinitus tradita, ut Deum esse trinum, etc. Et circa hæc opinari falsum hoc ipso inducit hæresim, etc. *Indirecte* ex quibus consequitur aliquid contrarium fidei; [sicut si quis diceret, Samuelem non fuisse filium Helcanæ; ex hoc enim sequitur, Scripturam divinam esse falsam. Circa hujusmodi ergo,] absque periculo hæresis, aliquis falsum potest opinari [antequam consideretur vel determinatum sit, quod ex hoc sequitur aliquid contrarium fidei et maxime si non pertinaciter adhæreat. A matter becomes a point of faith in two manners; first directly, as in the case of those things which have been handed down to us mainly by Divine action, as that God is Three Persons. And a false opinion about those points brings heresy. Secondly, indirectly, on which something follows contrary to the faith, as if someone were to say that Samuel was not the son of Elkanah, for it follows from this that Divine Scripture is untrue. A man can have a wrong opinion, without being in danger of heresy, before the question, whether anything contrary to the faith follows upon it, is considered and determined, and particularly if he does not hold obstinately to it.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] p[ars.] 1. Q[uæst.] xxxii. A[rt.] 4. [in conclus. Migne, i. 746.]—There are things necessary to the faith; and things which are but accessory, etc. Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Book iii. chap. iii. [4. *Works*, vol. i. p. 356. ed. Church and Paget.—His words are: It is not that we make some things necessary, some things accessory and appendent only: for our Lord and Saviour Himself doth make that difference, etc.]

aim than to confound the reader. But to come closer both to the Jesuit and his defender A. C.: if all points made firm by full authority of the Church be fundamental, then they must grant that everything determined by the Council of Trent is fundamental in the faith. For with them it is firm and catholic which that Council decrees. Now that Council decrees, "That orders collated by the bishop are not void, though they be given without the consent or calling of the people, or of any secular power."[40] And yet they can produce no author that ever acknowledged this definition of the Council fundamental in the faith. It is true, I do not grant that the decrees of this Council are made by full authority of the Church: but they do both grant and maintain it; and therefore it is *argumentum ad hominem*, a good argument against them, that a thing so defined may be firm, for so this is; and yet not fundamental, for so this is not.

SECTION X.

XV. But A. C. tells us further, "That if one may deny, or doubtfully dispute against, any one determination of the Church, then he may against another, and another, and so against all; since all are made firm to us by one and the same Divine revelation, sufficiently applied by one and the same full authority of the Church, which being weakened in any one, cannot be firm in any other." First, A. C. might have acknowledged that he borrowed the former part of this out of Vincentius of Lerins.[41] And as that learned father uses it, I subscribe to it, but not as A. C. applies it. For Vincentius speaks there *de catholico dogmate*, "of catholic maxims"; and A. C. will force it to every determination of the Church. Now catholic maxims, which are properly fundamental,[42] are certain prime truths deposited with the Church, and not so much determined by the Church as published and manifested, and so

A. C. p. 45.

[40] Si quis dixerit . . . ordines ab episcopis collatos, sine populi vel potestatis sæcularis consensu aut vocatione, irritos esse, . . . Anathema sit. [If any one says that orders conferred by Bishops without the consent and approval of their people or of the civil power are void, let him be accursed.—Decret.] Con. Trid. Sess. xxiii. [die xv. Julii, an. MDLXIII.] Can. 7.

[41] [Lerins is an island near Cannes in the Mediterranean, where Vincentius founded a monastery and Greek School. He published his *Commonitorium* in 434. The Athanasian Creed is traced by modern scholars to him or his disciples.]

[Vincent. Lirinens.] *Cont. Hær.* c. xxxi. Abdicata etenim qualibet parte Catholici dogmatis, alia quoque, atque item alia, quid aliud ad extremum sequetur, nisi ut totum pariter repudietur? [For if one part of the Catholic dogma is given up, and then another and then yet another, what happens in the end, except the equal repudiation of the whole?]

[42] [*V. infra*,] Sect. xxxviii. 21.

[CHAPTER II.] made firm by her to us. For so Vincentius expressly.[43] Where, all that the Church doth, is but *ut hoc idem quod antea*, "that the same thing may be believed which was before believed," but with more light and clearness, and, in that sense, with more firmness than before. Now, in this sense, give way to a *disputator errans*, "every cavilling disputer," to deny or quarrel at the maxims of Christian religion, any one, or any part of any one of them; and why may he not then take liberty to do the like of any other, till he have shaken all? But this hinders not the Church herself, nor any appointed by the Church, to examine her own decrees, and to see that she keep *dogmata deposita*, the principles of faith unblemished and uncorrupted. For if she do not so, but that *novitia veteribus*,[44] "new doctrines" be added to the old, the Church, which is *sacrarium veritatis*, "the repository of verity," may be changed *in lupanar errorum*; I am loth to English it. By the Church, then, this may—nay it ought to be done; however, every wrangling disputer may neither deny, nor doubtfully dispute, much less obstinately oppose, the determinations of the Church; no, not where they are not *dogmata deposita*, these "deposited principles." But if he will be so bold to deny or dispute the determinations of the Church, yet that may be done without shaking the foundation, where the determinations themselves belong but to the fabric, and not to the foundation. For a whole frame of building may be shaken, and yet the foundation,
A. C. p. 46. where it is well laid, remain firm. And therefore, after all, A. C. dares not say the foundation is shaken, but only in a sort. And then it is as true, that in a sort it is not shaken.

[43] Ecclesia, depositorum apud se dogmatum custos, etc. Denique quid unquam Conciliorum decretis enisa est, nisi, ut quod antea simpliter credebatur, hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur? [The Church is the guardian of the dogmas deposited with her. . . . Indeed what else has she attempted by the decrees of her Councils than to effect that, what so far has been believed without dispute, should be believed with all diligent effort in the future?]—Vin. Lir. *cont. Hæres.* c. xxxii. [p. 71.]

[44] Vin. Lir. *cont. Hæres.* cap. xxxi. [Sed et e contra, si novitia veteribus, extranea domesticis, et profana sacratis admisceri cœperint, proserpat hic mos in universum necesse est, ut nihil posthac apud ecclesiam relinquatur intactum, nihil illibatum, nihil integrum, nihil immaculatum, sed sit ibidem deinceps] impiorum ac turpium errorum lupanar, ubi erat ante castæ et incorruptæ sacrarium veritatis. [But, on the contrary, should new principles begin to be mixed up with the old, foreign principles with genuine principles, and worldly principles with religious, obviously this custom would creep over us till it became general, so that nothing in the Church would be left unharmed, nothing unimpaired, nothing complete, nothing uncorrupted, and thus the Church would become the haunt of foul and base errors, which used to be the holy home of pure and unspoilt truth.—*Ibid.* p. 70.]

XVI. (ii.) For the second part of his argument, A. C. must pardon me if I dissent from him. For, first, all determinations of the Church are not made firm to us by one and the same Divine revelation. For some determinations of the Church are made firm to us *per chirographum Scripturæ*,[45] "by the handwriting of the Scripture," and that is authentical indeed. Some other decisions, yea, and of the Church too, are made, or may be (if Stapleton[46] inform us right), without an evident, nay without so much as a probable, testimony of Holy Writ. But Bellarmine[47] falls quite off in this, and confesses in express terms, "That nothing can be certain by certainty of faith, unless it be contained immediately in the word of God, or be deduced out of the word of God by evident consequence." And if nothing can be so certain, then certainly no determination of the Church itself, if that determination be not grounded upon one of these—either express word of God, or evident consequence out of it. So here is little agreement in this great point between Stapleton and Bellarmine. Nor can this be shifted off, as if Stapleton spake of the word of God written, and Bellarmine of the word of God unwritten, as he calls tradition. For Bellarmine treats there of the knowledge which a man hath of the certainty of his own salvation. And I hope A. C. will not tell us, there is any tradition extant unwritten, by which particular men may have assurance of their several salvations. Therefore Bellarmine's whole disputation there is quite beside the matter; or else he must speak of the written word, and so lie cross to Stapleton, as is mentioned. But to return: If A. C. will, he may, but I cannot, believe that a definition of the Church which is made by the express word of God, and another which is made without so much as a probable testimony of it, or a clear deduction from it, are made firm to us by one and the same Divine revelation. Nay, I must say in this case, that the one determination is firm by Divine revelation, but the other hath no Divine revelation at all, but the Church's authority only.

2. Secondly, I cannot believe neither, "That all determinations

[45] Vin. Lir. *cont. Hæres.* cap. xxxii.

[46] *Relect. Cont.* iv. Q[uæst.] i. Art. 3. Etiamsi nullo Scripturarum, aut evidenti, aut probabili testimonio, etc. [Although by no evident nor even probable witness of Scripture.]—[*ubi sup.* note 6.]

[47] Non potest aliquid certum esse certitudine fidei, nisi, aut immediate contineatur in verbo Dei, aut ex verbo Dei per evidentem consequentiam deducatur.—Bellarmin. *de Justificat.* lib. iii. cap. 8. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. iv. col. 963.]

[CHAPTER II.] of the Church are sufficiently applied by one and the same full authority of the Church." For the authority of the Church, though it be of the same fulness in regard of itself, and of the power which it commits to General Councils lawfully called; yet it is not always of the same fulness of knowledge and sufficiency, nor of the same fulness of conscience and integrity, to apply *dogmata fidei*, that which is dogmatical in the faith. For instance, I think you dare not deny that the[48] Council of Trent was lawfully called; and yet I am of opinion that few, even of yourselves, believe that the Council of Trent hath the same fulness with the Council of Nice, in all the forenamed kinds or degrees of fulness. Thirdly, suppose that all the determinations of the Church are made firm to us by one and the same Divine Revelation, and sufficiently applied by one and the same full authority; yet it will not follow, that they are all alike fundamental in the faith. For I hope A. C. himself will not say, that the definitions of the Church are in better condition than the propositions of Canonical Scripture. Now, all propositions of Canonical Scripture are alike firm, because they all alike proceed from Divine Revelation; but they are not all alike fundamental in the faith. For this proposition of Christ to St. Peter and St. Andrew, "Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men," is as firm a truth as that which He delivered to His disciples, "that He must die, and rise again the third day." For both proceed from the same Divine Revelation, out of the mouth of our Saviour, and both are sufficiently applied by one and the same full authority of the Church, which receives the whole Gospel of St. Matthew to be canonical and infallible Scripture. And yet both these propositions of Christ are not alike fundamental in the faith. For I dare say, no man shall be saved, in the ordinary way of salvation, that believes not the death and the resurrection of Christ. And I believe A. C. dares not say, that no man shall be saved into whose capacity it never came, that Christ made St. Peter and St. Andrew fishers of men. And yet should he say it, nay, should he show it *sub annulo piscatoris*, no man will believe it that hath not made shipwreck

Matt. iv. 19.

Matt. xvi. 21.

[48] [The Council of Trent was first called by Pope Paul III. (Farnese); it was renewed under Julius III. (Monte) at Trent on the frontier of the Austrian and the Venetian dominions; it was reassembled for the third time by Pius IV. (Medici), in January 1562, and ended in December 1563. It published a new Creed, which became the Creed of Rome. The Italian Bishops outnumbered all the other Bishops present. Its historians were Pallavicini, a Jesuit, and Paolo Sarpi, a Venetian.]

of his common notions. Now if it be thus between proposition and proposition issuing out of Christ's own mouth, I hope it may well be so also between even just and true determinations of the Church, that, supposing them alike true and firm, yet they shall not be alike fundamental to all men's belief.

§. Secondly, I required to know, what points the Bishop would account fundamental. He said, all the points of [in] the Creed were such . . . .

§ 11.

§. I. Against this I hope you except not. For since the fathers[49] make the Creed the rule of faith; since "the agreeing sense of Scripture with those articles are the two regular precepts by which a divine is governed about the faith"[50]; since your own Council of Trent[51] decrees, "That it is that principle of faith, in which all that profess Christ do necessarily agree, *et fundamentum firmum et unicum*, not the firm alone, but the only, foundation"; since it is excommunication[52] *ipso jure*, for any man to contradict the articles contained in that Creed; since the whole body of the faith is so contained in the Creed, as that the substance[53] of it was believed even before the coming of Christ, though not so expressly as since in the number of the articles; since Bellarmine[54] confesses, that "all things simply necessary for all men's

[49] Tertull. *Apol. contra Gentes*, cap. xlvii. [Migne, i. 519.] And [Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis, et irreformabilis. There is one single rule of faith which cannot be changed and cannot be improved.—*Id.*] *de virg. vel.* cap. i. [Migne, ii. 889.]—S. Augustin. *Serm.* xv. [xix.] *de Temp.* cap. 2. [Nam quomodo in regula fidei confiteremur, credere nos in Filium Dei qui natus est ex virgine Maria, si non Filius Dei, sed filius hominis natus est ex virgine Maria? etc. For what right have we to say in the Creed that we believe in the Son of God Who is born of the Virgin Mary, if the person born of the Virgin Mary was the son of a man and not of God?—*Serm.* clxxxvi. cap. 2. *Op.*, tom. v. col. 885. D.] —Ruffin. [*Exposit.*] *in Symbol.* apud [Opusc. vulgo] S. Cyprian. [adscript. p. cxcviii. *ad calcem* ed. Benedict.]

[50] Alb. Magnus. in I. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xi. A[rt.] 7.

[51] Concil. Trident. Sess. 3. [*Vide infra*, note 56.]

[52] Bonavent. *ibid.* [*i.e.* in I. *Sentent.* Distinct. xi. Art. 1.] Dub. 2. et 3. in literam. [*Op.*, tom. iv. p. 93. D.]

[53] Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secundæ*, Q[uæst.] i. Art. 7. C. [Migne, iii. 19.]

[54] Bellarmin. lib. iv. *de verbo Dei non script.* cap. xi. [The quotation is hardly fair. This is Bellarmine's statement.] Primum est, [quædam in doctrina Christiana tam fidei, quam morum, esse simpliciter omnibus necessaria ad salutem, qualis est notitia articulorum Symboli Apostolici, item cognitio decem præceptorum, et nonnullorum Sacramentorum. Cætera non ita necessaria sunt, ut sine eorum explicita notitia, et fide, et professione homo salvari non possit, modo promptam habeat voluntatem ea suscipiendi, et credendi, quando sibi fuerint legitime per Ecclesiam proposita. First, there are in the teaching of Christianity certain points both of faith and of morals which we absolutely require for salvation; as for instance the knowledge of the articles of the Apostles' Creed,

[CHAPTER II.] salvation are in the Creed and the Decalogue"; what reason can you have to except? And yet for all this, everything fundamental is not of a like nearness to the foundation, nor of equal primeness in the faith. And my granting the Creed to be fundamental, doth not deny but that there are *quædam prima credibilia*,[55] "certain prime principles of faith," in the bosom whereof all other articles lay wrapped and folded up. One of which since Christ, is that of St. John: "Every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh is of God." And one, both before the coming of Christ and since, is that of St. Paul: "He that comes to God, must believe that God is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek Him."

1 John iv 2.

Heb. xi. 6.

A. C. p. 46. II. Here A. C. tells you, "That either I must mean that those points are only fundamental which are expressed in the Creed; or those also which are enfolded. If I say those only which are expressed, then," saith he, "to believe the Scriptures is not fundamental, because it is not expressed. If I say those which are enfolded in the articles, then some unwritten Church traditions may be accounted fundamental." The truth is, I said, and say still, that all the points of the Apostles' Creed, as they are there expressed, are fundamental. And therein I say no more than some of your best learned have said before me. But I never either said or meant, that they only are fundamental: that they are *fundamentum unicum*,[56] "the only foundation," is the Council of Trent's; it is not mine. Mine is, That the belief of Scripture to be the word of God and infallible, is an equal, or rather a preceding, prime principle of faith, with or to the whole body of the Creed. And this agrees (as before I told the Jesuit), with one of your own great masters, Albertus [57]

and the acceptance of the ten Commandments, and of some of the Sacraments. The remaining points are not so necessary as to make a man's salvation impossible without an explicit knowledge and faith and profession of them, so long as his will is ready to accept them and believe them when they are properly set before him by the Church.—*Op.*, tom. i. col. 201. B.]

[55] Tho. *Secund. Secundæ*, Quæst. i. Art. 7. C. [Migne, iii. 19.]

[56] Conc. Trident. Sess. 3. [Symbolum fidei, quo Sancta Romana Ecclesia utitur, tanquam principium illud, in quo omnes, qui fidem Christi profitentur, necessario conveniunt, ac fundamentum firmum et unicum, contra quod portæ inferi, etc. The symbol of faith (the Creed) is what the Holy Roman Church uses, as it were, as the alphabet of belief in which all must necessarily agree, if they confess the faith of Christ; and it is the sure and sole foundation against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.]

[57] [Albertus Magnus, a famous Schoolman Doctor, born in Swabia in 1193, called to Rome and made Grand Master of the Palace by Pope Alexander IV. *c.* 1260; then conse-

Magnus,[58] who is not far from that proposition *in terminis*. So here the very foundation of A. C.'s dilemma falls off. For I say not, That only the points of the Creed are fundamental, whether expressed or not expressed. That all of them are, that I say. And yet, though the foundation of his dilemma be fallen away, I will take the boldness to tell A. C. that if I had said, That those articles only which are expressed in the creed are fundamental, it would have been hard to have excluded the Scripture, upon which the Creed itself in every point is grounded. For nothing is supposed to shut out its own foundation. And if I should now say, That some articles are fundamental which are enfolded in the Creed, it would not follow that therefore some unwritten traditions were fundamental. Some traditions I deny not true and firm, and of great, both authority and use in the Church, as being apostolical, but yet not fundamental in the faith. And it would be a mighty large fold, which should lap up traditions within the Creed. As for that tradition, That the books of Holy Scriptures are divine and infallible in every part, I will handle that when I come to the proper place[59] for it. SECTION XI.

ℭ. I asked how then it happened, as[60] Mr. Rogers saith, That the English Church is not yet resolved what is the right sense of the article of Christ's descending into hell.

ℬ. I. The English Church never made doubt, that I know, what was the sense of that article. The words are so plain, they bear their meaning before them. She was content to put that article among those to which she requires subscription, not as doubting of the sense, but to prevent the cavils of some, who had been too busy in crucifying that article, and in making it all one with the article of the Cross, or but an exposition of it. § 12. Art. iii.

crated Bishop of Ratisbon; was called the Universal Doctor from his immense learning; died 1280.]

[58] In I. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xi. A[rt.] 7. Regula fidei est concors Scripturarum sensus cum articulis fidei: quia illis duobus regularibus præceptis regitur theologus. [The rule of faith is the agreement of Scripture together with the Articles of belief; these are the two fixed laws which govern the theologian.]—[*ubi sup.* p. 50. note 56.]

[59] [*Vide infra,*] sect. xvi. 1.

[60] [His book on the Articles was a reply to Dr. Bound, a Puritan minister, who had published a work on the Sabbath, in 1595. He lived at Horningsheath in Suffolk. His work is republished by the Parker Society.]

[CHAPTER II.] II. And surely, for my part, I think the Church of England is better resolved of the right sense of this article than the Church of Rome, especially if she must be tried by her writers, as you try the Church of England by Mr. Rogers. For you cannot agree whether this article be a mere tradition, or whether it hath any place of Scripture to warrant it. Scotus[61] and Stapleton[62] allow it no footing in Scripture; but Bellarmine[63] is resolute that this article is everywhere in Scripture, and Thomas[64] grants as much for the whole Creed. The Church of England never doubted it, and St. Augustine[65] proves it.

[61] Scotus in I. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct.] xi. Q[uæst.] 1. [*Op.*, tom. v. p. 589. Dico quod Christum descendisse ad inferna, non docetur in Evangelio: et tamen tenendum est sicut articulus fidei, quia ponitur in Symbolo Apostolorum. I say that the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell is not taught in the Gospel; but none the less it must be held to be an article of belief because it is set forth in the Apostles' Creed.]

[62] [Stapleton was a famous Roman controversialist, born in Sussex in 1535; died at Louvain in 1597.]

Stapleton, *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] v. [de potestate ecclesiæ ex parte objecti,] Q[uæst.] 5. A[rt.] 1. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 790. Symbolum fidei de fide tenemus: aliqua tamen in illo sunt quæ Scriptura tacet, ut Christum descendisse ad inferos, esse Ecclesiam Catholicam et Apostolicam, esse communionem sanctorum. The Creed we hold as an article of faith; and there are in it some things of which the Scripture says nothing, as that Christ descended into Hell, there is a Catholic and Apostolic Church, and there is a Communion of Saints.]

[63] Bellarm. [lib.] iv. *de Christo*, [*i.e.* de Christi anima,] cap. 6, 12. Scripturæ passim hoc docent. [The Scriptures teach this in several passages.] [*Acts* ii. *Non derelinques animam meam in inferno.* Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell. Et *Ephes.* iv. 27; *Descendit ad inferos terræ.* He descended into the lower parts of the earth. Et præterea in Symbolo Apostolico legimus: *Descendit ad inferos.* And further we read in the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into Hell." —(Cap. xii.) Quantum ad tertium probo ex Scripturis Christum vere descendisse ad inferos. As to the third point, I prove from the Scriptures that Christ truly descended into Hell. sc. *Ps.* cvii. 16. *Ecclus.* xxiv. 45. (Vulg.) *Mat.* xii. 40. *Act.* ii. 31. *Rom.* x. 7. *Ephes.* iv. 9.]

[64] Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 9. [Migne, iii. 24.]

[65] S. Aug. *Ep.* xcix. [*ad Evodium, Ep.* clxiv. cap. 1. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 573. Migne, ii. 709 and 715. Quæstio quam mihi proposuisti ex epistola apostoli Petri, solet nos, ut te latere non arbitror, vehementissime commovere, quomodo illa verba accipienda sunt tanquam de inferis dicta. . . . (Cap. 5.) Quamobrem teneamus firmissime, quod fides habet fundatissima auctoritate firmata, *quia Christus mortuus est secundum Scripturas, et quia sepultus est, et quia resurrexit tertia die secundum Scripturas*, et cætera quæ de Illo testatissima veritate conscripta sunt. In quibus etiam hoc est, quod apud inferos fuit, solutisque eorum doloribus, quibus Eum erat impossibile teneri, a quibus etiam recte intelligitur solvisse et liberasse quos voluit, corpus quod in cruce reliquerat in sepulchro positum recepisse. As to the question which you have put me out of St. Peter's Epistle, we are often greatly troubled, as I think you know, how those words are to be taken for they seem to speak about hell. Wherefore let us hold this fast, for here our faith rests on most sure authority, "that Christ died according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again on the third day according to the Scriptures," and the other doctrines which are written about Him with the most approved truth. Among them is this,

III. And yet, again, you are different for the sense. For you agree not whether the soul of Christ, *in triduo mortis*, "in the time of His death," did go down into hell really, and was present there, or virtually and by effects only. For Thomas[66] holds the first, and Durand[67] the latter. Then you agree not whether the soul of Christ did descend really and in essence into the lowest pit of hell, and place of the damned, as Bellarmine[68] once held probable and proved it; or really only into that place or region of hell which you call *limbum patrum*, and then but virtually from thence into the lower hell; to which Bellarmine[69] reduces himself, and gives his reason, because it is the common opinion[70] of the school. Now the Church of England takes the

that He was in Hell, and loosed its pains, because they could not hold Him, and it is rightly understood that He loosed and freed whom He would, and then took again the body which He had left lying in the sepulchre.

In this Epistle Augustine acknowledges the great difficulty of interpreting *1 Peter* iii. 19-20. He quotes several other passages to prove the Descent into Hell.]

[66] [Thomas Aquinas, son of the Count of Aquino in Naples, born *circa* 1227; became a monk of Monte Casino; a scholar of Albertus Magnus, acknowledged by Urban IV. and Clement IV. as the first theologian of the age. He died in 1274. He was diligently studied by Laud.]

Thom. [Aquin.] pars Tert. Q[uæst.] lii. A[rt.] 2. Per suam essentiam.

[67] [Durandus was Bishop of Mende, born *circa* 1232, and died in 1296; a Frenchman.]

Durand. in III. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct.] xxii. Q[uæst.] 3.

[68] Bellarm. lib. iv. *de Christo* [*i.e.* de Christi anima,] cap. 16. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 466. Primum dubium: *ad quæ loca inferni descenderit.* B. Thomas (Tert. par. 1. Quæst. lii. Art. 2.) docet Christum per realem præsentiam solum descendisse ad limbum patrum, per effectum autem ad omnia loca inferni . . . At probabile est profecto, Christi animam ad omnia loca inferni descendisse. Primo propter locum illum *Ecclus.* (sc. xxiv. 45. in Vulg.) *Penetrabo omnes*, etc. Nam quod B. Thomas respondet, hoc intelligi de penetratione per effectum, non videtur satisfacere. Nam hoc modo possumus cum Durando dicere, ad nullum locum Christum descendisse aliter quam per effectum, cum Scriptura non distinguat loca. Secundo quia Augustin. in *Epist.* xcix. (or clxiv.) dicit, Eum descendisse ad loca inferni, ubi erant dolores et tormenta, etc. The first doubtful point is, To what places in hell he descended. St. Thomas teaches that Christ in actual presence only descended as far as the Limbus Patrum, but that He descended by His influence into every part of Hell. . . . But certainly it is probable that the soul of Christ descended into every part of hell. This is proved, first by the passage in *Ecclesiasticus* (xxiv. 45 in the Vulgate), "I will enter into all, etc." For St. Thomas' answer that this means entrance by influence does not seem sufficient. For in this fashion we might say with Durand, that Christ descended nowhere except by influence, since the Scripture makes no distinction of parts. We give as our second proof that Augustine says in his 99th letter, that He descended into those parts of Hell where the pains and torments were, etc.

Bellarmine also quotes Fulgentius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Gregory of Nyssa as agreeing with him.]

[69] Bellarmin. *Recog.* p. 11. [Præf. ad. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 4.—*De Christo*, lib. iv. cap. 16, § *At probabile*, etc. Bellarmine quotes St. Thomas Aquinas and others for Christ's sufferings in Hell.

[70] Sequuntur enim [sc. Scholastici] Tho. [Aquin. in] part. Tert. l. 3. Q[uæst.] lii. A[rt.] 2.

[CHAPTER II.] words as they are in the Creed, and believes them without further dispute, and in that sense which the ancient primitive fathers of the Church agreed in. And yet if any in the Church of England should not be thoroughly resolved in the sense of this article, is it not as lawful for them to say, "I conceive thus or thus of it; yet if any other way of His descent be found truer than this, I deny it not, but as yet I know no other," as it was for Durand[71] to say it, and yet not impeach the foundation of the faith?

℣. The ℟. said, that Mr. Rogers was but a private man. "But," said I, "if Mr. Rogers writing as he did by public authority, be accounted only a private man, . . ."

§ 13. ℟. I. I said truth, when I said Mr. Rogers was a private man. And, I take it, you will not allow every speech of every man, though allowed by authority to have his books printed, to be the doctrine of the Church of Rome. This[72] hath been oft complained of on both sides: the imposing particular men's assertions upon the Church; yet I see you mean not to leave it. And surely, as controversies are now handled by some of your party at this day, I may not say it is the sense of the article in hand, but I have long thought it a kind of descent into hell, to be conversant in them. I would the authors would take heed in

[71] Non est pertinaciter asserendum, quin anima Christi per alium modum nobis ignotum potuerit descendere ad infernum: nec nos negamus alium modum esse forsitan veriorem; sed fatemur nos illum ignorare. [We must not obstinately assert that the soul of Christ was unable to descend into Hell in some manner unknown to us; nor do we deny that there is perhaps a truer manner; all we say is that we do not understand it.]—Durand. in III. *Sent.* Distinct. xxii. Quæst. 3. No. 9. [fol. cclxxxii.]

[72] And this was an ancient fault too, for St. Augustine checks at it in his time. Noli [ergo, frater, contra divina tam multa, tam clara, tam indubitata testimonia,] colligere [velle] calumnias ex episcoporum scriptis, sive [nostrorum, sicut] Hilarii; sive [antequam pars Donati separaretur, ipsius unitatis, sicut] Cypriani et Agrippini: primo, quia hoc genus literarum ab auctoritate canonis distinguendum est. Non enim sic leguntur tanquam ita ex iis testimonium proferatur, ut contra sentire non liceat, sicubi forte aliter sapuerunt, quam veritas postulat. [Forbear then, my brother, when the witness against it in God's Book is so large, so plain, and so indisputable — forbear to choose to collect sophistries out of bishops' writings, whether they be our supporters like Hilary, or were like Cyprian and Agrippinus, who lived in the days of unity, before the Donatist party separated from us: first, because this kind of literature stands in a different category to the writings of the Canon. For the testimony of their writings cannot be brought forward as not allowing of a difference of opinion, since their opinion may have differed from what truth demands.]—S. Augustin. *Ep.* xlviii. [*ad Vincentium*, *Ep.* xciii. cap. x. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 245. E. ed. Benedict. Migne, ii. 338.] And yet these were far greater men in their generations than Mr. Rogers was.

time, and not seek to blind the people, or cast a mist before evident truth, lest it cause a final descent to that place of torment. But since you will hold this course, Stapleton was of greater note with you than Mr. Rogers' "Exposition of Notes upon the Articles of the Church of England" is with us. And as he, so his Relection. And is it the doctrine of the Church of Rome which Stapleton affirms,[73] "The Scripture is silent that Christ descended into hell, and that there is a Catholic and an Apostolic Church?" If it be, then what will become of the Pope's supremacy over the whole Church? Shall he have his power over the Catholic Church given him expressly in Scripture —in the keys, to enter—and in *pasce*, to feed when he is in—and when he had fed, to confirm; and in all these not to err and fail in his ministration: and is the Catholic Church, in and over which he is to do all these great things, quite left out of the Scripture? Belike the Holy Ghost was careful to give him his power; yes, in any case; but left the assigning of his great cure, the Catholic Church, to tradition. And it were well for him, if he could so prescribe for what he now claims.

SECTION XIII.

Matt. xvi. 19. John xxi. 15, 16. Luke xxii. 32.

II. But what if, after all this, Mr. Rogers there says no such thing? As in truth he doth not. His words are: "All Christians acknowledge, He descended; but in the interpretation of the article, there is not that consent that were to be wished."[74] What is this to the Church of England, more than others? And again, "Till we know the native and undoubted sense of this article,"[75] is Mr. Rogers' "we" the Church of England —or rather his and some others' judgment in the Church of England?

III. Now here A. C. will have somewhat again to say, though, God knows, it is to little purpose. It is, "that the Jesuit urged Mr. Rogers' book, because it was set out by public

A. C. p. 47.

[73] Stapl. *Cont.* v. Q[uæst.] 5. A[rt.] 1. [*ubi sup.* p. 52. note 62.]

[74] Rogers in *Art. Eccles. Angl.* art. 3. [Also that Christ went down into hell, all sound Christians both in former days (*He descended into hell*, Apost. Sym.) and now living (Helvet. Confess. ii. c. 11, etc., Basil. art. 4. Augsburg. art. 3, etc.,) do acknowledge; howbeit in the interpretation of the Article, there is not that consent as were to be wished: some holding that Christ descended into hell, 1. as God only . . . 2. as man only . . . 3. as God and man in one person . . . .—*A Treatise upon sundry Matters contained in the XXXIX. Articles of Religion which are professed in the Church of England.* Long since written and published by Thomas Rogers, pp. 15, 16. ed. London, 1639.]

[75] *Ibid.* [But till we know the native and undoubted sense of this article and mystery of religion, persist we adversaries unto them which say, that Christ descended not into hell at all, etc.—p. 17.]

[CHAPTER II.]

authority, and because the book bears the title of 'The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England.'"[76] A. C. may undoubtedly urge Mr. Rogers, if he please; but he ought not to say that his opinion is the doctrine of the Church of England, for neither of the reasons by him expressed. First, not because "his book was publicly allowed." For many books among them, as well as among us, have been printed by public authority, as containing nothing in them contrary to faith and good manners, and yet containing many things in them of opinion only, or private judgment, which yet is far from the avowed positive doctrine of the Church, the Church having as yet determined neither way by open declaration upon the words or things controverted. And this is more frequent among their schoolmen than among any of our controversers, as is well known. Nor, secondly, "because his book bears the title of 'The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England.'" For suppose the worst, and say Mr. Rogers thought a little too well of his own pains, and gave his book too high a title: is his private judgment therefore to be accounted the Catholic doctrine of the Church of England? Surely no: no more than I should say, everything said by Thomas,[77] or Bonaventure[78] is angelical or seraphical doctrine, because one of these is styled in the Church of Rome "sera-

[76] [The first form of Rogers' work was a tabular analysis, without any exposition of the Articles, published in two parts, under the title: The English Creede, consenting with the true auncient Catholique and Apostolique Church in al the points and articles of Religion which euerie Christian is to knowe and beleeue that would be saued. The first parte, in most loyal maner, to the glorie of God, credit of our Church, displaieng of all hæresies and errors both old and newe contrarie to the faith, subscribed vnto by Thomas Rogers. *Allowed by auctho-ritie.* Imprinted by Iohn Windet, etc. London, 1585. The second part, *ibid.* 1587. The preface is dated 6 February 1585; and the occasion of the work is stated to be "the great subscription urged from the pastors and ministers of the word and sacraments in a great part of this and the last year. The causes of the same being either secret, I cannot, or not convenient to be published, I may not set down." The other and enlarged editions of the work abandon the tabular form, add a commentary and exposition, adopt the title given in the preceding note, and for a running head use the words, "The Catholick Doctrine believed and professed in the Church of England." But it must be remarked that the imprint "allowed by aucthoritie," on which A. C. remarks, occurs only in the first edition, and not in those editions which, consisting of what Laud calls "Exposition of Notes," contain the passage commenting on the sense of our Lord's descent into hell.]

[77] Angelici D[octoris] S[ancti] Tho. *Summa*, [in Tit.]

[78] Celebratissimi Patris Dom. Bonaventuræ Doctoris Seraphici in III. *Sent. Disputata*, [in Tit.]

[A disciple of St. Francis of Assissi: became General of the Franciscans: known as the Seraphic Doctor, as Thomas Aquinas is the Angelic Doctor: died in 1274 at the Council of Lyons.]

phical," and the other, "angelical doctor." And yet their works are printed "by public authority," and that title given them.

IV. "Yea, but our private authors," saith A. C. "are not allowed, for aught I know, in such a like sort to express our Catholic doctrine in any matter subject to question." Here are two limitations, which will go far to bring A. C. off, whatsoever I shall say against him. For first, let me instance in any private man, that takes as much upon him as Mr. Rogers doth; he will say, He knew it not; his assertion here being no other, than "for aught he knows." Secondly, If he be unwilling to acknowledge so much, yet he will answer, It is not just in such a like sort as Mr. Rogers doth it; that is, perhaps, it is not the very title of his book. But well then: Is there never a private man allowed in the Church of Rome to express your Catholic doctrine in any matter subject to question? What! not in any matter? Were not Vega and Soto[79] two private men? Is it not a matter subject to question—to great questions in these days, whether a man may be certain of his salvation, *certitudine fidei*, "by the certainty of faith"? Doth not Bellarmine[80] make it a controversy? And is it not a part of your Catholic faith, if it be determined in the Council of Trent?[81] And yet these two great friars of their time, Dominicus Soto and Andreas Vega,[82] were of contrary opinions; and both of them challenged the decree of the Council —and so consequently your Catholic faith to be as each of them concluded; and both of them wrote books to maintain their opinions, and both of their books were published "by authority." And therefore I think it is allowed in the Church of Rome, to private men, to express your Catholic doctrine, and in a matter subject to question. And therefore also, if another man in the Church of England should be of a contrary opinion to Mr. Rogers, and declare it under the title of "The Catholic Doctrine of the

[79] [Dominicus Soto was the leading Dominican speaker at the early sessions of the Council of Trent under Pope Paul III. Andreas Vega was the leading Franciscan at the same Council. See Sarpi *passim.*]

[80] Bellarm. lib. iii. *de Justificat.* cap. 1. 14.

[81] Sed concilii Tridentini, cui Catholici omnis ingenia sua atque judicia sponte subjiciunt, [decretum audiamus, *Sicut nemo pius*, etc.—Listen to the decree of the Council of Trent to which all Catholics willingly submit their own ideas and decisions.]—Bellarmin. lib. iii. *de Justific.* cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. iv. col. 950.]

[82] *Hist. Concil. Trident.* lib. ii. p. 245. edit. Lat. Leidæ, 1622.—(Paul. Sarpi,) *Histor. Concil. Trident.* lib. ii. p. 153. ed. Aug. Trinobant. 1620.]

[CHAPTER II.] Church of England," this were no more than Soto and Vega did in the Church of Rome. And I, for my part, cannot but wonder
A. C. p. 47. A. C. should not know it. For he says, that "for aught he knows," private men are not allowed so to express their Catholic doctrine. And in the same question, both Catharinus[83] and Bellarmine[84] take on them to express your Catholic faith: the one differing from the other almost as much as Soto and Vega, and perhaps in some respects more.

> ℭ. But if Mr. Rogers . . . be . . . only a private man, in what book may we find the Protestants' public doctrine? The ℬ. answered, that to the book of Articles they were all sworn; . . .

§ 14. ℬ. I. What! was I so ignorant to say, "The Articles of the Church of England were the public doctrine of all the Protestants"; or, "That all Protestants were sworn to the Articles of England," as this speech seems to imply? Sure I was not. Was not the immediate speech before, of the Church of England? And how comes the subject of the speech to be varied in the next lines? Nor yet speak I this, as if other Protestants did not agree with the Church of England in the chiefest doctrines, and in the main exceptions which they jointly take against the Roman Church, as appears by their several Confessions. But if A. C. will say, as he doth, "That because there was speech before of the Church of England, the Jesuit understood me in a limited sense, and meant only the Protestants of the English Church,"—be it so; there is no great harm done[85] but this, that the Jesuit offers to enclose me too much. For I did not say, that the Book of Articles only was the continent of the Church of England's public doctrine. She is not so narrow, nor hath she purpose to exclude anything which she acknowledges hers, nor doth she wittingly permit any crossing of her public declarations; yet she is not such a shrew to her children as to deny her blessing, or denounce an anathema against them, if some peaceably dissent in some particulars remoter from the foundations, as your own Schoolmen differ. And if the Church of Rome, since she grew to her greatness, had not been so fierce in this course, and too particular in determining too many things, and making them matters of

[83] [A leading Theologian at the Council of Trent during the early sessions. He stood almost alone in his views about original sin.]

[84] Bellarmin. lib. iii. *de Justif.* cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. iv. col. 949.]

[85] And therefore A. C. needs not make such a noise about it, as he doth, p. 48.

necessary belief, which had gone for many hundreds of years before, only for things of pious opinion, Christendom, I persuade myself, had been in happier peace at this day, than, I doubt, we shall ever live to see it.

II. Well, but A. C. will prove "the Church of England a shrew, and such a shrew. For in her Book[86] of Canons, she excommunicates every man, who shall hold anything contrary to any part of the said Articles." So A. C. But surely these are not the very words of the Canon, nor perhaps the sense. Not the words; for they are: "Whosoever shall affirm that the Articles are in any part superstitious, or erroneous," etc. And perhaps not the sense. For it is one thing for a man to hold an opinion privately within himself; and another thing boldly and publicly to affirm it. And again, it is one thing to hold contrary to some part of an article, which perhaps may be but in the manner of expression; and another thing positively to affirm, that the articles in any part of them are superstitious and erroneous. But this is not the main of the business; for though the Church of England denounce excommunication, as is before[87] expressed, yet she comes far short of the Church of Rome's severity, whose anathemas are not only for thirty-nine articles, but for very many more,[88] above one hundred in matter of doctrine, and that in many points as far remote from the foundation; though, to the far greater rack of men's consciences, they must be all made fundamental, if that Church have once determined them: whereas the Church of England never declared, that every one of her articles are fundamental in the faith. For it is one thing to say, No one of them is superstitious or erroneous: and quite another to say, Every one of them is fundamental, and that in every part of it, to all men's belief. Besides, the Church of England prescribes only to her own children, and by those articles provides but for her own peaceable consent in those doctrines of truth. But the Church of Rome severely imposes her doctrine upon the whole world, under pain of damnation.

NOTE FROM STILLINGFLEET'S VINDICATION OF LAUD, i. 87.

['So the late learned Lord Primate of Ireland often expresseth the sense of the Church of England as to her thirty-nine Articles.

[86] [Canon. v.] [87] Canon v. [88] Concil. Trident.

[CHAPTER II.] "Neither doth the Church of England," saith he, "define any of these questions as necessary to be believed, either *necessitate medii*, or *necessitate præcepti*, which is much less; but only bindeth her sons, for peace sake, not to oppose them." And in another place more fully: "We do not suffer any man to reject the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England at his pleasure; yet neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving faith, or legacies of Christ and His Apostles; but in a mean, as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them." By which we see what a vast difference there is between those things which are required by the Church of England in order to peace, and those which are imposed by the Church of Rome, as part of that faith, "extra quam non est salus," without belief of which there is no salvation. In which she hath as much violated the unity of the Catholic Church as the Church of England by her prudence and moderation hath studied to preserve it.']

[CHAPTER III.

The Church of England rests on the infallible Rock of Holy Scripture.

SECTION XIV.

The most important part of the whole book is to be found in the arguments on the authority of Scripture. It is the result of Laud's ripest thought; the edition of 1639 consists of 388 pages; of these no less than 47 pages are quite additional matter on this particular and crucial point. They are elaborated upon the arguments of 1624, in order to explain the position of the English Church in resting absolutely on Holy Scripture. This, and the additional matter in Section 38 (Chapter XIV. of this edition) on the certainty of salvation in the English Church, which spreads over 46 pp., and the denial of the right of Rome to be judge in her own cause, Section 25 (Chapter VIII.), which covers 35 pp., are by far the longest additions made to the book in its present shape. Each objection is frankly met. And the controversialist does not deny the immense difficulty of establishing his case. Only no other solution is to his mind so satisfactory as the solution he propounds.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

The written Scripture by itself without unwritten tradition is the foundation of faith. And from Scripture the English Church draws all the positive Articles of Faith. To Fisher's objection that the Scripture does not teach the necessity of infant baptism, Laud answers that the necessity of infant baptism is inferred from St. John iii. 5; and supported by Acts ii. 38 and 39, and St. Mark x. 14. Tradition may guide and help us to see the truth of Scripture, but it cannot be the foundation of Scripture.

But then, how are we to know what is Scripture? where is the proof? Fisher pleads that the accuracy of Scripture rests upon the tradition of the Church. Laud replies that this would be to argue in a circle; for the authority of the Church rests upon scriptural proof.

[CHAPTER III.] *He combines four reasons, for acknowledging the Scriptures to be of divine origin, as bringing sufficient weight if used in combination; (a) the testimony of the Church which leads us to Scripture; (b) the light from Scripture and the testimony so given by Scripture to itself; (c) the witness of the Holy Ghost within us; (d) the proof provided by natural reason.*

Of these the first argument taken by itself would make the Church superior to Scripture: the inward light of Scripture does not in practice give sufficient proof, for some books of Scripture have been honestly questioned; the third by itself would produce dangerous pride in those who felt they possessed this witness which was not given to others; as for reason, man must use it; it is a duty to use it; and it proves the truth of Scripture (1) by the confession made by the false heathen gods and (2) by the good effect of the Gospel on the nations which have received Christianity: but still human reason by itself is not large enough to measure divine things.]

℣. . . . and that the Scriptures only, not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of their faith.

§ 15. ℟. I. The Church of England grounded her positive articles upon Scripture; and her negative do refute there, where the thing affirmed by you is not affirmed by Scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it. And here, not the Church of England only, but all Protestants, agree most truly and most strongly in this, "That the Scripture is sufficient to salvation, and contains in it all things necessary to it." The Fathers[1] are plain, the School-

[1] S. Basil. *de vera et pia Fide.* Manifesta defectio Fidei est, importare quicquam eorum quæ scripta non sunt. [φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων. It is an evident falling away from the faith and a proof of insolence, either to make of no account any part of Scripture, or to add to it anything which is not Scripture.—S. Basil. *de Fide*, cap. 1. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 224. D. ed. Benedict. Migne, iii. 680.]—S. Hilar. lib. ii. [cap. 8.] *ad Const. Aug.* [vero te, domine Constanti Imperator, admiror] fidem tantum secundum ea quæ scripta sunt desiderantem, etc. Hoc qui repudiat Antichristus est: et qui simulat, anathema est. [Truly I admire thee, Lord Emperor Constantius, claiming that faith be according to Scripture only, etc. . . . He who rejects this is Antichrist, and every one who imitates him is anathema.—*Op.*, col. 1229. F. ed. Benedict. Migne, ii. 569.]—S. Aug. *de Doctrina Christiana*, lib. ii. cap. 9. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 24. D. ed. Benedict. Migne, iii. 42.] In iis [enim] quæ aperte in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, moresque vivendi. [Among the points openly set forth in Scripture are to be found all those which contain the true faith, the right way of living.]—And to this place Bellarmine, lib. iv. *de verbo Dei non scripto*, c. 11. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 206.] saith, that St. Augustine speaks, de illis dogmatibus quæ necessaria sunt omnibus simpliciter [qualia sunt quæ habentur in Symbolo Apostolico, et in decalogo,] "of those points of faith,

men[2] not strangers in it. And have not we reason then to account it, as it is, the foundation of our faith? And Stapleton[3] himself, though an angry opposite, confesses, "that the Scripture is in some sort the foundation of faith, that is, in the nature of testimony, and in the matter or thing to be believed." And if the Scripture be the foundation to which we are to go for witness, if there be doubt about the faith, and in which we are to find the thing that is to be believed as necessary in the faith, we never did, nor never will refuse any tradition that is universal and apostolic, for the better exposition of the Scripture; nor any definition of the Church, in which she goes to the Scripture for what she teaches, and thrusts nothing as fundamental in the faith upon the world, but what the Scripture fundamentally makes *materiam credendorum*, "the substance of that which is so to be believed," whether immediately and expressly in words, or more remotely, till a clear and full deduction draw it out.

SECTION XV.

II. Against the beginning of this paragraph, A. C. excepts. And first he says: "It is true, that the Church of England grounded her positive articles upon Scripture; that is, it is true, if themselves may be competent judges in their own cause." But this, by the leave of A. C. is true, without making ourselves judges in our own cause. For "that all the positive articles of the present Church of England are grounded upon Scripture," we are content to be judged by the joint and constant belief of the Fathers, which lived within the first four or five hundred years after Christ, when the Church was at the best; and by the Councils held within those times; and to submit to them in all those points of doctrine. Therefore, we desire not to be judges in our

A. C. p. 48.

which are necessary simply for all men," [such as those which are contained in the Apostles' Creed and in the Decalogue.] So far then he grants the question. And that you may know, it fell not from him on the sudden, he had said as much before, in the beginning of the same chapter, and here he confirms it again.

[2] Scotus. *Prolog. in Sentent.* Q[uæst.] ii. [c. 14. *Op.*, tom. v. p. 63. Scriptura sufficienter continet doctrinam necessariam viatori. [The Scripture contains enough of the teaching which is necessary for the wayfaring man.] — Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 10. in doctrina Christi et Apostolorum, veritas fidei est sufficienter explicata. [In the teaching of Christ and the Apostles the true faith is sufficiently set forth.]—And he speaks there of the written word.

[3] Scripturam fundamentum et columnam fidei fatemur in suo genere esse, sc. in genere testimoniorum, et in materia credendorum.—[We acknowledge the Scripture to be the pillar and foundation of the faith in its own kind, that is to say, in giving us the evidence, and in supplying us with the articles of faith.] —Stapleton, *Relect. Con.* iv. Quæst. i. Art. 3. in fine. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 774.]

[CHAPTER III.]

own cause. And if any whom A. C. calls "a novelist" can trul say and maintain this, he will quickly prove himself no novelist And for the negative articles, they refute, where the thing affirme by you is either not affirmed in Scripture, or not directly to b concluded out of it. Upon this negative ground, A. C. infer again, "That the baptism of infants is not expressly, at least no evidently, affirmed in Scripture, nor directly, at least not demon stratively, concluded out of it." In which case, he "professes, h would gladly know, what can be answered to defend this doctrin to be a point of faith necessary for the salvation of infants." And in conclusion, "professes he cannot easily guess what answer ca be made, unless we will acknowledge authority of Church tradi tion necessary in this case."

A. C. p. 49.

III. And truly, since A. C. is so desirous of an answer, I wil give it freely. And first in the general. I am no way satisfie with A. C.'s addition—"not expressly, at least not evidently." What means he? If he speak of the letter of the Scripture, then whatsoever is expressly, is evidently, in the Scripture; and so hi addition is vain. If he speak of the meaning of the Scripture then his addition is cunning; for many things are expressly i Scripture, which yet in their meaning are not evidently there And whatever he mean, my words are, "That our negativ articles refute that which is not affirmed in Scripture," withou any addition of "expressly" or "evidently"; and he should hav taken my words as I used them. I like nor change nor addition nor am I bound to either of A. C.'s making. And I am as littl satisfied with his next addition—"nor directly, at least no demonstratively, concluded out of it." For are there not man things in good logic concluded directly, which yet are not con cluded demonstratively? Surely there are. For to be directly o indirectly concluded, flows from the mood or form of the syllo gism; to be demonstratively concluded, flows from the matter o nature of the propositions. If the propositions be prime an necessary truths, the syllogism is demonstrative and scientifical because the propositions are such. If the propositions be pro bable only, though the syllogism be made in the clearest mood yet is the conclusion no more. The inference or consequence indeed, is clear and necessary; but the consequent is but pro bable, or topical, as the propositions were. Now, my words wer only for a direct conclusion, and no more: though in this case might give A. C. his caution. For Scripture here is the thin

spoken of. And Scripture being a principle, and every text of Scripture confessedly a principle among all Christians, whereof no man desires[4] any further proof, I would fain know, why that which is plainly and apparently, that is, by direct consequence, proved out of Scripture, is not demonstratively or scientifically proved—if at least he think there can be any demonstration in divinity: and if there can be none, why did he add "demonstratively?" SECTION XV.

IV. Next, in particular: I answer to the instance which A. C. makes concerning the baptism of infants, That it may be concluded directly (and let A. C. judge, whether not demonstratively) out of Scripture, both that infants ought to be baptized, and that baptism is necessary to their salvation. And first, That baptism is necessary to the salvation of infants, (in the ordinary way of the Church, without binding God to the use and means of that sacrament, to which He hath bound us,)[5] is express in St. John iii.: "Except a man be born again of water, and the Spirit, he A. C. p. 49.

[4] Habitum fidei in ordine ad Theologiæ disciplinam se habere, ut habitus intellectus se habet ad humanas scientias.—[A habit of faith has the same relation to the instructions of Theology, as a habit of intellectual perception has to human sciences.]—M[elchior] Canus, *de loci*[s] *Theologicis*,] lib. ii. cap. 8. [cap. 56. ed. Lovan. 1569.]

[5] St. Augustine expressly of the Baptism of infants. *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*. Lib. i. cap. 30. [*Op.*, tom. x. col. 32. D.] and lib. ii. cap. 27. [col. 63. C.] and lib. i. [*ad Hieronym.* seu *Ep.* clxvi. (al. xxviii.)] [*de origine animæ hominis*, cap. vii. 21. *Op.*, tom. ii. par. 2. col. 591. G. Migne, ii. 729.]—Nay, they of the Roman party, which urge the baptism of infants as a matter of faith, and yet not to be concluded out of Scripture, when they are not in eager pursuit of this controversy, but look upon truth with a more indifferent eye, confess as much (even the learnedest of them) as we ask. Advertendum autem Salvatorem, dum dicit, 'Nisi quis renatus,' etc. necessitatem imponere omnibus, ac proinde [etiam] parvulos debere renasci ex aqua et Spiritu. [But we must listen to our Saviour when He says "except a man be born again": He imposes the necessity on all, and therefore the little children also must be born again of water and the Holy Ghost.]—[Corn.] Iansen [ii. *Comment.*] *in* [*Concord.*] *Evang.* cap. xx. [p. 157. ed. Lovan. 1571.] So here is baptism necessary for infants, and that necessity imposed by our Saviour, and not by the Church only.—Hæretici [qui cum duo tantum faciant sacramenta, Baptismum et Eucharistiam, doceantque etiam baptizandos infantes, nec ullo] alio quam hoc Scripturæ testimonio probare possint, infantes esse baptizandos. [Heretics, while they make only two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, teach also that infants must be baptized, and by no other evidence than this of Scripture can prove that infants must be baptized.]—Mald[onat.] *in S. Joann.* iii. 5. So Maldonatus confesses that the Heretics (we know whom he means) can prove the baptism of infants by no testimony of Scripture but this: which speech implies, That by this testimony of Scripture it is and can be proved, and therefore not by Church tradition only. And I would fain know, why Bellarmine, *de Baptismo*, lib. i. cap. 8. sect. 5. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 269. D. Porro Catholica Ecclesia semper docuit infantes baptizandos . . . Probatur hæc veritas tribus argumentorum generibus. Primum, sumitur

[CHAPTER III.]

cannot enter into the kingdom of God." So, no baptism, no entrance. Nor can infants creep in any other ordinary way. And this is the received opinion of all the ancient Church of Christ.[6] And secondly, That infants ought to be baptized, is, first, plain by

a scripturis: habemus autem in scripturis tria argumenta. Primum sumitur a figura Testamenti Veteris . . . Secundum argumentum colligitur ex duobus locis Evangelii simul junctis, *Joann.* iii. 5. Nisi quis renatus, etc. . . . At quod parvuli non pereant Dominus docet, *Mat.* xix. 14, *Mar.* x. 14, et *Luc.* xviii. 16. Sinite parvulos, etc. . . . Tertium argumentum colligitur ex locis illis, ubi dicuntur baptizatæ integræ familiæ, ut *Actor.* xvi. 15. dicitur Lydia baptizata, et domus ejus: Again, the Catholic Church has always taught that infants must be baptized. . . . This truth is proved by three kinds of proof. . . . First it is taken from Scripture; and in Scripture we have three proofs. The first is taken from the antitype in the Old Testament—the second is taken from two passages of the Gospel put together—*John* iii. 5, Except a man be born again, etc. . . . But the Lord teaches that little children are not lost—*Mat.* xix. 14, *Mark* x. 14, and *Luke* xviii. 16, Suffer little children, etc. . . . The third argument is derived from those places where whole families are said to have been baptized, as *Acts* xvi. 15. Lydia is said to have been baptized with her whole house]—should bring three arguments out of Scripture to prove the baptism of infants, (Habemus in scripturis tria argumenta, etc.) if baptism cannot be proved at all out of Scripture, but only by the tradition of the Church.—And yet, this is not Bellarmine's way alone, but Suarez's in Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Part. Tert. Q[uæst.] lxviii. [Art. 10.] Disput. xxv. Sect. i. § 2. possunt] tamen. ex illa varia argumenta sumi ad eam confirmandam, [*Actor.* enim xvi. legimus, etc. . . .] Nec dissimile [argumentum sumitur ex ipsa institutione baptismi, et ex illis verbis *Joann.* iii. etc. Out of Scripture various proofs can be taken to confirm this. For in *Acts* xvi. we read, etc. And much the same proof is obtained from the very institution of baptism itself and from the words in *John* iii. etc.]—And Gregorius de Valentia, *de Suscipientibus Baptismum*,—And the Pope himself, Innocent III. [Arelatensi Archiepiscopo] *Decretal.* lib. iii. Tit. 42. cap. Majores.—And they all jump with S. Ambros. lib. x. Epist. 84. *ad Demetriad. Virg.*, who expressly affirms it, Pædobaptismum esse constitutionem Salvatoris. And proves it out of *St. John* iii. 5.—[Infant Baptism is appointed by our Saviour. This epistle, *ad Demetriadem*, is rejected by the Benedictine editors. See Appendix to *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 477, 478. ed. Benedict. It has been variously attributed to St. Leo Magn. by his editor Quesnel; and to St. Prosper of Aquitaine by his editor Antelmn. See S. Prosp. Aquit. *Op.*, p. 930. ed. Paris. 1711.]

[6] Infantes reos esse originalis peccati, et ideo baptizandos esse, antiquam fidei regulam vocat S. Aug. [That infants are guilty of original sin and therefore need to be baptized is called the old rule of faith by St. Augustine. *Sermo* clxxiv. Migne, v. 944.]—Et, Nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, hoc a majorum fide percepit. And again, let no one therefore whisper contrary doctrines in your ears. This is what the Church always held, this she always kept, this she received from the faith of her elders.—S. Aug. *Serm.* x. [clxxvi. ed. Benedict.] cap. 2. *de verbis Apost.* [*1 Tim.* i. Fidelis sermo et omni acceptione, etc. *Op.*, tom. v. col. 840. A. Migne, v. 950.]—And [Pseudo-] S. Ambros. lib. x. Epist. 84.—And S. Chrysostom. *Homil. de Adam et Eva.* [The following passage may perhaps be that referred to in this vague citation.—S. Chrysostom. *in Genesim*, Sermo vii. cap. 5. *Op.*, tom. iv. p. 681. C.]—Hoc prædicat Ecclesia Catholica ubique diffusa. [This the Church teaches, wherever she goes.—Concil. Milevit. Canon ii. Concil. tom. ii. col. 1538. C.]

evident and direct consequence out of Scripture. For if there be no salvation for infants in the ordinary way of the Church, but by baptism, and this appear in Scripture, as it doth, then out of all doubt, the consequence is most evident out of that Scripture, That infants are to be baptized, that their salvation may be certain. For they which cannot help themselves,[7] must not be left only to extraordinary helps; of which we have no assurance, and for which we have no warrant at all in Scripture; while we, in the meantime, neglect the ordinary way and means commanded by Christ. Secondly, it is very near an expression in Scripture itself. For when St. Peter had ended that great sermon of his, he applies two comforts unto them, "Amend your lives, and be baptized, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And then, he infers, "For the promise is made to you, and to your children." The promise! what promise? What? Why, the promise of sanctification by the Holy Ghost. By what means? Why, by baptism: for it is expressly, "Be baptized, and ye shall receive"; and as expressly, "This promise is made to you, and your children." And therefore A. C. may find it, if he will, That the baptism of infants may be directly concluded out of Scripture. For some of his own party, Ferus[8] and Salmeron,[9] could both find it there. And so, if it will do him any pleasure, he hath my answer, which, he saith, "he would be glad to know."

Acts ii. 38, 39.

[7] [Commendaverim caritati vestræ] causam eorum, qui pro se loqui non possunt. I would have commended to your charity the cause of those who cannot speak for themselves. — S. Augustin. *Serm.* viii. cap. 8. *de verb. Apost.* Migne, v. 944.]

[8] [Ferus wrote a commentary on St. John, published in 1536, etc.; his real name was Wild.]

Nullum excipiens, [non marem, non fœminam, non servum, non liberum,] non Judæum, non Gentilem, nec adultum, nec puerum, [et omnibus indicat esse necessarium baptisma. None is excepted, male or female, bond nor free, Jew nor Gentile, neither adult nor child; and to all he declares that baptism is needful for them.—Reverendi patris D. Joannis] Feri, etc. [*Enarrationes in Acta Apostolor.*] in *Act.* ii. 39. [p. 28. Coloniæ, 1567.]

[9] [Salmeron was one of the original band of Jesuits who joined with Ignatius in founding the Order, on Ascension Day, 1534.]

[*Vobis enim est repromissio, et filiis vestris,*] . . . Et ad filios vestros, [quos multum juvat parentum fides, sicut nocet infidelitas:] quare debent consentire, cum ad usum rationis perveniunt, ad implenda promissa in Baptismo. ["The promise is to you and to your children." To your children who are much helped by their parents' faith, and much hurt if they are faithless; wherefore the children ought to agree when they come to the age of discretion to fulfil the promises made for them in Baptism.]—Salmeron. Tractat. xiv. in loc. [sc. *Act.* ii. 39. *Comment.* tom. xii. pp. 87, 88. ed. Colon. 1614.]

[CHAPTER III.]

V. It is true, Bellarmine[10] presses a main place out of St. Augustine, and he urges it hard. St. Augustine's words are, "The custom of our mother the Church in baptizing infants is by no means to be contemned, or thought superfluous; nor yet at all to be believed, unless it were an apostolical tradition."[11] The place is truly cited, but seems a great deal stronger than indeed it is. For, first, it is not denied, that this is an apostolical tradition, and therefore to be believed. But, secondly, not therefore only. Nor doth St. Augustine say so, nor doth Bellarmine press it that way. The truth is, it would have been somewhat difficult to find the collection out of Scripture only for the baptism of infants, since they do not actually believe. And therefore St. Augustine is at *nec credenda nisi*, that this custom of the Church had not been to be believed, had it not been an apostolical tradition. But the tradition being apostolical, led on the Church easily to see the necessary deduction out of Scripture. And this is not the least use of tradition, to lead the Church into the true meaning of those things which are found in Scripture, though not obvious to every eye there. And that this is St. Augustine's meaning is manifest by himself, who best knew it. For when he had said, as he doth,[12] That to baptize children is *antiqua fidei regula*, "the ancient rule of faith," and "the constant tenet of the Church," yet he doubts not to collect and deduce it out of Scripture also. For when Pelagius urged, that infants needed not to be baptized, because they had no original sin, St. Augustine relies not upon the tenet of the Church only, but argues from the text thus: "What need have infants of Christ if they be not sick? 'For the sound need not the physician.'"[13] And again, "Is not this said by

Matt. ix. [12].

[10] Bellarmin. *de verbo Dei* [*non scripto*,] lib. iv. cap. 9. § 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 193. B.]

[11] S. Aug. [*de*] *Gen*[*esi*,] *ad Lit.* [lib. x.] cap. 23. [*Op.*, tom. iii. par. 1. col. 272. D. Migne, iii. 426. Consuetudo [tamen] Matris Ecclesiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est, [neque ullo modo superflua deputanda,] nec omnino credenda, nisi Apostolica esset traditio.

[12] Quare [novis disputationibus] antiquam fidei regulam frangere conaris? [Why do you try to break the ancient rule of faith with new arguments?]—S. Aug. *Serm.* viii. [clxxiv.] *de verb. Apost.* cap. 8. [See note 7.]—Hoc Ecclesia semper [habuit, semper] tenuit. [This the Church always held, and to this she always kept.]—*Id. Serm.* x. [clxxvi.] cap. 2. [See note 6.]

[13] [Quoniam (*Matth.* ix. 12.) non est opus sanis medicus, sed ægrotantibus,] quid necessarium [ergo] habuit infans Christum, si non ægrotat? [Si sanus est, quare per eos qui eum diligunt, medicum quærit? Since the whole have no need of a physician, but the sick, what need had the infant of Christ if he were not sick? If he is whole, why does he look for a physician by the act of them who love him?—S. Aug. *Serm.* clxxvi. See note 6.]—Quid est quod dicis, nisi ut non accedant ad Jesum? Sed tibi clamat

Pelagius, *ut non accedant ad Jesum?* 'that infants may not come to their Saviour'? *Sed clamat Jesus*, 'but Jesus cries out,' 'Suffer little ones to come unto Me.'" And all this is fully acknowledged by Calvin,[14] namely, "That all men acknowledge the baptism of infants to descend from apostolical tradition." And yet that "it doth not depend upon the bare and naked authority of the Church."[15] Which he speaks not in regard of tradition, but in relation to such proof as is to be made by necessary consequence out of Scripture over and above tradition.

SECTION XV.

Mark x. 14.

VI. As for tradition, I have said enough for that,[16] and as much as A. C. where it is truly apostolical. And yet if anything will please him, I will add this concerning this particular, the baptizing of infants, that the Church received this by tradition from the Apostles.[17] By tradition. And what then? May it not directly be concluded out of Scripture, because it was delivered to the Church by way of tradition? I hope A. C. will never say so. For certainly in doctrinal things nothing so likely to be a tradition apostolical as that which hath a root and a foundation in Scripture.[18]

A. C. p. 49.

Jesus, Sine parvulos venire ad Me. [What are you saying but that they are not to come to Jesus? But Jesus calls to you, Suffer the little children to come unto Me.]—S. Augustin. [*Serm.* clxxiv. See note 6.]

[14] Nullus est scriptor tam vetustus, qui non ejus originem ad apostolorum seculum pro certo referat. [There is no writer, however old, who does not place the origin of infant baptism back in the age of the Apostles, as a certain truth.]—Calvin. *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 16. § 8. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 357. col. 1.]

[15] [Aiunt pædobaptismum non tam ex aperto scripturæ mandato, quam ex ecclesiæ decreto emanasse. At] miserrimum asylum foret, si pro defensione pædobaptismi ad nudam ecclesiæ auctoritatem suffugere cogeremur. [They say that the custom of the Baptism of children was derived not so much from the plain command of Scripture, as from the decree of the Church. But it would be a most wretched protection, if for the defence of the Baptism of children we were obliged to take refuge in the bare authority of the Church.]—Calvin. *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 8. § 16. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 311. col. 2.]

[16] [*Vide sup.*] sect. xv. 1.

[17] Origen. *in Rom.* vi. 6. tom. ii. p. 543. Pro hoc [et] ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare. [For this reason the Church received from the Apostles a traditional command to give baptism to little children also.]—[*Comment. in Rom.* lib. v. cap. 9. *Op.*, tom. iv. p. 565. A. col. 2. ed. Benedict. Migne, iv. 1047.]—Et S. Aug. *Serm.* x. [clxxvi.] *de verb. Apost.* cap. 2. [Migne, v. 944. See note 6.] Hoc ecclesia a majorum fide percepit. [The Church received this from the faith of the ancients]—And it is to be observed that neither of these Fathers (nor I believe any other) says that the Church received it "a traditione sola," by tradition only; or "a majorum fide sola," or from the faith of the elders only, as if tradition did exclude collection of it out of Scripture.

[18] Yea, and Bellarmine himself avers, *De verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv. cap. x. § 7: Sic etiam omnes traditiones continentur in scriptis in universali. [So also, all the traditions are contained in Scripture in a general way.]—*Op.*, tom. i. col. 196. C.] And St. Basil, Serm. *de fide*, approves only those Agrapha, quæ non sunt aliena a pia secundum Scripturam sententia. [Unwritten doctrines, which

[CHAPTER III.] For Apostles cannot write or deliver contrary, but subordinate and subservient, things.

℣. I asked how he knew Scripture to be Scripture, and in particular Genesis, Exodus, etc. These are believed to be Scripture, yet not proved out of any place of Scripture. The ℟. said, that the books of Scripture are principles to be supposed, and needed not to be proved.

§ 16. ℟. I. I did never love too curious a search into that which might put a man into a wheel, and circle him so long between proving Scripture by tradition, and tradition by Scripture, till the devil find a means to dispute him into infidelity, and make him believe neither. I hope this is no part of your meaning. Yet I doubt this question, "How do you know Scripture to be Scripture?"[19] hath done more harm, than you will be ever able to help by tradition. But I must follow that way which you draw me. And because it is so much insisted upon by you,[20] and is in itself a matter of such consequence, I will sift it a little further.

are not contrary to a pious judgment resting on Scripture.]—S. Basil. Serm. *de fide*, cap. 1. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 224. B. ed. Benedict. Migne, iii. 677.]

[19] Volentes destruere fidem nostram, per occasionem unius aut alterius quæstionis aut difficilis, aut forte et indissolubilis, [adversantes scripturis] festinant fidem [Christi et Evangeliorum ejus] tollere [de anima nostra. Those who wish to destroy our faith by using the opportunity offered by some special question, which is either difficult or perhaps even insoluble, and who, opposing the teaching of Scripture, are in a hurry to deprive our souls of faith in Christ and His Gospels.]—Origen. *Q.* [*i.e.* Tractat.] xxxv. *in Matth.* [Erasmo interpret. tom. ii. p. 231. ed. Frobenii, Basil. 1545. et in *Matth. Comment.* Ser. 134. *Op.*, tom. iii. p. 923. D. ed. Benedict. Migne, iii. 1782.]

[20] "To know that Scriptures are divine and infallible in every part, is a foundation so necessary, as if it be doubtfully questioned, all the faith built upon Scripture falls to the ground." A. C. p. 47.—Quarto, necesse est nosse, extare libros aliquos vere divinos, [quod certe nullo modo ex Scripturis haberi potest. Nam etiamsi Scriptura dicat, libros prophetarum et apostolorum esse divinos, tamen non certo id credam, nisi prius credidero, Scripturam, quæ hoc dicit, esse divinam. In the fourth place it is necessary we should know that there are in existence some divinely-inspired books and that certainly cannot be got out of Scripture. For although Scripture should say that the books of the prophets and apostles are divinely inspired, I certainly should not believe that statement until I first believed that the Scripture, which declares this, is itself divinely inspired.—Bellarm. *de verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv. cap. 4. § 15. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 175. B.]—Sexto, oportet etiam [non solum scire qui sint libri sacri, sed etiam in particulari] istos, qui sunt in manibus, esse illos. [Non enim satis est credere Evangelium Marci esse verum, Evangelium Thomæ non esse verum, sed oportet etiam credere, hoc evangelium, quod nunc legitur sub nomine Marci, esse illud verum et incorruptum quod scripsit Marcus, quod certo ex Scripturis haberi non potest. Sixthly, we ought also to know not only which are the divinely-

II. Many men labouring to settle this great principle in divinity, have used divers means to prove it. All have not gone the same way, nor all the right way. You cannot be right, that resolve "faith of the Scriptures," being the "word of God," into "only tradition." For "only," and "no other" proof are equal. To prove the Scripture, therefore (so called by way of excellence), to be the word of God, there are several offers at divers proofs. For first, some fly to the testimony and witness of the Church, and her tradition, which constantly believes, and unanimously delivers it. Secondly, some to the light and the testimony which the Scripture gives to itself; with other internal proofs which are observed in it, and to be found in no other writing whatsoever. Thirdly, some to the testimony of the Holy Ghost, which clears up the light that is in Scripture, and seals this faith to the souls of men, that it is God's word. Fourthly, all that have not imbrutished themselves, and sunk below their species and order of nature, give even natural reason leave to come in, and make some proof, and give some approbation upon the weighing and the consideration of other arguments. And this must be admitted, if it be but for pagans and infidels, who either consider not or value not any one of the other three: yet must some way or other be converted, or "left without excuse"; and that is done by this very evidence. Section XVI. Rom. i. 20.

III. For the first: the "tradition of the Church," which is your way. That taken and considered alone, it is so far from being the only, that it cannot be a sufficient, proof to believe by divine faith, that Scripture is the word of God. For that which is a full and sufficient proof, is able of itself to settle the soul of man concerning it. Now, the tradition of the Church is not able to do this. For it may be further asked, Why we should believe the Church's tradition? And if it be answered, We may believe, because the Church is infallibly governed by the Holy Ghost; it may yet be demanded of you, How that may appear? And if this be demanded, either you must say, you have it by special revelation, which is the "private spirit" you object to other men,

inspired books, but also definitely that these same books are still in our hands. For it is not enough to believe that the Gospel of St. Mark is true, and the Gospel of St. Thomas is not true; we also ought to believe that the Gospel which now goes by the name of St. Mark is that same Gospel which St. Mark wrote and true and uncorrupted; and this certainly cannot be got from Scripture.]—[*Ibid.* col. 175. D.]

[CHAPTER III.]

or else you must attempt to prove it by Scripture,[21] as all of you do. And that very offer, to prove it out of Scripture, is a sufficient acknowledgment that the Scripture is a higher proof than the Church's tradition, which, in your own grounds, is or may be questionable till you come thither. Besides, this is an inviolable ground of reason: "That the principles of any conclusion must be of more credit than the conclusion itself."[22] Therefore if the Articles of faith, the Trinity, the Resurrection, and the rest, be the conclusions, and the principles by which they are proved be only ecclesiastical tradition, it must needs follow, that the tradition of the Church is more infallible than the articles of the faith, if the faith which we have of the articles should be finally resolved into the veracity of the Church's testimony. But this your learned and wary men deny,[23] and therefore I hope yourself dare not affirm.

IV. Again, if the voice of the Church, saying the books of Scripture commonly received are the Word of God, be the formal object of faith, upon which alone absolutely I may resolve myself; then every man not only may, but ought to, resolve his faith into the voice or tradition of the Church: for every man is bound to

[21] Esse aliquas veras traditiones demonstratur ex Scripturis. [Scripture proves that there are some true traditions.]—Bellar. *de verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv. cap. 5. [See *Johannis* xvi. 12. Multa habeo, etc. I have many things to say to you. Et *Johan.* xxi. 25. Sunt autem et alia multa, etc. There are many other things.—*Op.*, tom. i. col. 177. D.] And A. C. p. 50. proves "tradition" out of *2 Thess.* ii. [15.]

[22] Aristot. *Post.* [*Analyt.* lib.] i. cap. 2. T. 16. per Pacium. Quocirca si διὰ τὰ πρῶτα, propter prima scimus et credimus, illa quoque scimus et credimus, μᾶλλον, magis, quia per illa scimus et credimus etiam posteriora. [Wherefore if διὰ τὰ πρῶτα, "on the evidence of the first things" we know and believe others, we certainly know and believe those first things (μᾶλλον) more thoroughly, because it is on their authority that we know and believe also the further things. [Ἀνάγκη, μὴ μόνον προγινώσκειν τὰ πρῶτα, ἢ πάντα ἢ ἔνια, ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον· ἀεὶ γὰρ, δι' ὃ ὑπάρχει ἕκαστον, ἐκεῖνο μᾶλλον ὑπάρχει· οἷον, δι' ὃ φιλοῦμεν, ἐκεῖνο φίλον μᾶλλον. Ὥστ', εἴπερ ἴσμεν διὰ τὰ πρῶτα καὶ πιστεύομεν, κἀκεῖνα ἴσμεν τε καὶ πιστεύομεν μᾶλλον, ὅτι δι' ἐκεῖνα καὶ τὰ ὕστερον. It is obligatory not only to begin by knowing the first things, all or some of them, but also by knowing them more thoroughly—for the thing on the strength of which something is established, is itself thoroughly established; as for instance love is proved more thoroughly by the fact that we love. Therefore since we know and believe because of the first things, we know and believe those first things more thoroughly, because on the strength of them we believe also the last things.—*Op.*, tom. i. p. 185. ed. Bekker. Oxon. 1837.]

[23] Eorum [hic] errorem dissimulare non possum, qui asserunt, fidem nostram eo, tanquam in ultimam credendi causam, reducendam esse, ut credamus ecclesiam esse veracem. I cannot deny the error of them who assert that our faith has to be reduced, as to a final reason for belief, to this point, that we believe in the truthfulness of the Church.—Melch. Can[us,] *de locis Theolog.* lib. ii. cap. 8. [p. 54. ed. Lovan. 1569.]

rest upon the proper and formal object of the faith. But nothing can be more evident than this, That a man ought not to resolve his faith of this principle into the sole testimony of the Church. Therefore, neither is that testimony or tradition, alone, the formal object of faith. The learned of your own part grant this:[24] "Although in that article of the Creed, 'I believe the Catholic Church,' peradventure all this be contained, 'I believe those things which the Church teacheth,' yet this is not necessarily understood, That I believe the Church teaching, as an infallible witness." And if they did not confess this, it were no hard thing to prove.

V. But here is the cunning of this device. All the authorities of Fathers, Councils, nay of Scripture too,[25] though this be contrary to their own doctrine, must be finally resolved into the authority of the present Roman Church; and though they would seem to have us believe the Fathers and the Church of old, yet they will not have us take their doctrine from their own writings, or the decrees of councils: because as they say, we cannot know by reading them what their meaning was, but from the infallible

[24] Ecclesiæ vox non est [ipsum] formale fidei objectum. [The voice of the Church is not the formal object of faith.]—Stapleton, *Relect.* [*Scholast. Princip. fid. doct.*] *Controv.* iv. [Capit. de potest. Eccles. in se consid.] Quæst. iii. Art. 2. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 752.]—And: in his verbis 'Credo Ecclesiam,' etsi forte contineatur hoc totum, Credo ea, quæ docet Ecclesia, tamen non intelligitur necessario quod Credo docenti Ecclesiæ tanquam testi infallibili. [In these words "I believe in the Church," although perhaps there is contained in them all this "I believe in those things which the Church teaches," still we do not of necessity understand "I believe in the Church teaching as in an infallible witness."]—*Ibid.* [pp. 754, 755.]—Ubi etiam [Stapleton] rejicit opinionem Durandi et Gabr. [Biel.] et Waldens. [In these words Stapleton rejects the opinion of Durand and of Biel, and of Waldensius.] Testimonium ecclesiæ Catholicæ est objectum fidei Christianæ et legislatio Scripturæ canonicæ. Subjicitur tamen ipsi sicut testis judici, et testimonium veritati, etc. [The witness of the Catholic Church is an object of Christian faith, and so is its legislation on Canonical Scripture; this witness is however subject to the Scripture as a witness is subject to the judge, or evidence subject to the truth.—Thom. Waldens.] *Doctrinalis Fidei*, tom. i. lib. ii. art. ii. cap. 21. [fol. 103. col. 4. ed. Paris. 1532.]—Nec si Ecclesia nobis aditum præbet ad hujusmodi sacros libros cognoscendos, protinus ibi acquiescendum est; sed ultra oportet progredi, et solida Dei veritate niti. Now if the Church gives us an entrance to the knowledge of the Sacred Books in this way, ought we to rest there, but to go forward and to base our faith on the solid truth of God.—Melch. Canus, *de loc. Theolog.* lib. ii. cap. 8. [p. 59. ed. Lovan. 1569.]

[25] Omnis ergo ecclesiastica auctoritas, cum sit ad testificandum de Christo, et legibus Ejus, vilior est Christi legibus, et Scripturis sanctis necessario postponenda. [Therefore all Church authority, since it exists to testify to Christ and His laws takes a lower rank than Christ's laws, and must obviously be inferior to the holy Scriptures.]—Thom. Wald. *Doctrinalis Fidei*, tom. i. lib. ii. art. ii. cap. 21. [fol. 103. col. 1. *ubi sup.*]

[CHAPTER III.] testimony of the present Roman Church teaching by tradition. Now, by this, two things are evident. First, that they ascribe as great authority, (if not greater,) to a part of the Catholic Church, as they do to the whole, which we believe in our Creed, and which is the society of all Christians. And this is full of absurdity, in nature, in reason, in all things, That any part[26] should be of equal worth, power, credit, or authority with the whole. Secondly, That in their doctrine concerning the infallibility of their Church, their proceeding is most unreasonable. For if you ask them, Why they believe their whole doctrine to be the sole true Catholic faith? their answer is, Because it is agreeable to the word of God, and the doctrine and tradition of the ancient Church. If you ask them, How they know that to be so? they will then produce testimonies of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers. But if you ask a third time, By what means they are assured, that these testimonies do indeed make for them and their cause? they will not then have recourse to text of Scripture, or exposition of Fathers, or phrase and propriety of language in which either of them were first written, or to the scope of the author, or the causes[27] of the thing uttered, or the conference with like places,[28] or the antecedents[29] and consequents of the same places;

[26] *Totum majus est sua parte.* Axioma nec ideo geometricum putandum est, quia geometres eo utatur. Utitur enim tota logica. [The whole is greater than one of its parts. This is an axiom, and not to be considered as a mere matter of geometry, because the geometrician uses it. For every logician uses it too.—Petr.] Rami, *Schol[arum] Math[ematicarum*, lib. vii. 9. 164. ed. Basil. 1569.]—And Aristotle vindicates such propositions, *τὰ ἐν τοῖς μαθήμασι καλούμενα ἀξιώματα*, from being usurped by particular sciences, *ἅπασι γὰρ ὑπάρχει*, etc. Quia conveniunt omni enti, et non alicui generi separatim. For they are the property of all, and not of one class. —*Metaph[ysic.* lib. iii. (al. iv.)] cap. 3.

[27] Intelligentia dictorum ex causis est assumenda dicendi; quia non sermoni res, sed rei est sermo subjectus. [The meaning of words is to be assumed from the reasons for speaking; for the matter is not subordinate to the expression, but the expression to the matter.]—S. Hilar. lib. iv. [cap. 14.] *de Trinit.* [*Op.*, col. 835. F. ed. Benedict. Migne, ii. 107.] Ex materia dicti dirigendus est sensus. [The sense must be directed by the matter of what is being spoken.] —Tertull. *lib. de Resur. Carnis*, cap. xxxvii. [p. 347. ed. Rigalt. Migne, ii. 847.]

[28] Videns differentias similium ad similia. [By seeing the differences of like things compared with like.] —Origen. *Tract. xix. in S. Matth.* [*Op.*, Lat. per Erasm. tom. ii. p. 112. —*Comment. in Matth.* tom. xvii. cap. 7. *Op.*, tom. iii. p. 775. D. ed. Benedict. Migne, iii. 1493.]

[29] Recolendum est unde venerit illa sententia, et quæ illam superiora pepererint, quibusque connexa dependeat. [We must go back to the origin of that opinion, and to its original propositions, and to the things with which it was connected and on which it depended.]—S. Aug. *Ep.* xxix. [lib. ii. *ad Hieronym.* seu *Epist.* clxvii. 3. *Op.*, tom. ii. par. 2. col. 595. G. ed. Benedict. Migne, ii. 734.]—Solet circumstantia Scripturæ illuminare sententiam. [The surroundings of

or[30] the exposition of the dark and doubtful places of Scripture by the undoubted and manifest; with divers other rules given for the true knowledge and understanding of Scripture, which do frequently occur in St. Augustine.[31] No, none of these, or the like helps: that, with them, were to admit a "private spirit," or to make way for it. But their final answer is: "They know it to be so, because the present Roman Church witnesseth it, according to tradition." So arguing *a primo ad ultimum*, "from first to last," the present Church of Rome and her followers believe her own doctrine and tradition to be true and Catholic, because she professes it to be such. And if this be not to prove *idem per idem*, "the same by the same," I know not what is: which, though it be most absurd in all kind of learning, yet out of this I see not how it is possible to wind themselves, so long as the last resolution of their faith must rest, as they teach, upon the tradition of the present Church only.

VI. It seems therefore to me very necessary,[32] that we be able to prove the books of Scripture to be the Word of God, by

Scripture generally throw light on its statements.]—S. Augustin. lib. *Octogintatrium Quæstionum*, Quæst. 69. [cap. 2. *Op.*, tom. vi. col. 56. C. ed. Benedict.]

[30] Quæ ambigue et obscure in nonnullis Scripturæ Sacræ locis dicta videntur, per ea, quæ alibi certa et indubitata habentur, declarantur.—S. Basil *in regulis contractis*, Reg. 267. [*τὰ ἀμφίβολα καὶ ἐπικεκαλυμμένως εἰρῆσθαι δοκοῦντα ἔν τισι τόποις τοῦ θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν ἄλλοις τόποις ὁμολογουμένων σαφηνίζεται.* The points which seem doubtfully and obscurely worded in some passages of inspired Scripture, are quite cleared up by plain passages in other places. —S. Basil. *Regul. brevius tractat.* Interrog. cclxvii. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 506. E. ed. Benedict. Migne, iii. 1264.] —Manifestiora quæque prævaleant, et de incertis certiora præscribant. [The clearer points carry the day and the more certain points decide the less certain.]—Tertull. *de Resurrectione* [*Carnis*], cap. xix. et xxi. [*Op.*, p. 336. C. ed. Rigalt.] Migne, ii. 820.] et xxi.—S. Aug. *de Doct. Christ.* lib. iii. cap. 26. [*Op.*, tom. iii. par. 1. col. 56. B. Migne, iii. 79.]—Moris est Scripturarum, obscuris manifesta subnectere, et quod prius sub ænigmatibus dixerint, aperta voce proferre. [It is the habit of Scripture to weave in clear sayings so as to explain dark ones, and to set forth with clear expressions what first had been spoken in mysteries.]—S. Hieron. *in Esa. xix.* [in] princip. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 127. ed. Benedict.]—*Vide* [*infra*,] Sect. 26. § iv.

[31] S. Aug. *de Doctr. Christ.* lib. iii. [cap. 24-29. *Op.*, tom. iii. par. 1. col. 55-57. Migne, iii. 78-79.]

[32] And this is so necessary that Bellarmine confesses, that if tradition, which he relies upon, be not Divine, he and his can have no faith: Non habemus fidem; fides enim verbo Dei nititur. [We have no faith; for faith rests on the word of God.]—*De verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv. cap. 4. par. 15. [Bellarmine's words are: Itaque hoc dogma tam necessarium, quod scilicet aliqua est Scriptura Divina, non potest sufficienter haberi ex sola Scriptura. Proinde cum fides nitatur verbo Dei, nisi habeamus verbum Dei non scriptum, nulla nobis erit fides. [Therefore is this dogma absolutely necessary, viz. that there is some Divine Scripture, but, what it is, is not sufficiently evident from Scripture alone. Therefore, since faith rests on the word of God, unless we have some

[CHAPTER III.] some authority that is absolutely divine. For if they be warranted unto us by any authority less than divine, then all things contained in them, which have no greater assurance than the Scripture, in which they are read, are not objects of divine belief. And that once granted will enforce us to yield, That all the articles of Christian belief have no greater assurance than human or moral faith or credulity can afford. An authority, then, simply divine, must make good the Scripture's infallibility, at least in the last resolution of our faith in that point. This authority cannot be any testimony or voice of the Church[33] alone. For the Church consists of men subject to error; and no one of them, since the Apostles' times, hath been assisted with so plentiful a measure of the Blessed Spirit, as to secure him from being deceived. And all the parts being all liable to mistaking, and fallible, the whole cannot possibly be infallible in and of itself, and privileged from being deceived in some things or other. And even in those fundamental things in which the whole universal Church neither doth nor can err, yet even there her authority is not Divine, because she delivers those supernatural truths by promise of assistance, yet tied to means; and not by any special immediate revelation, which is necessarily required to the very least degree of Divine authority. And therefore our worthies do not only say, but prove, "That all the Church's constitutions are of the nature

unwritten word of God, we shall have no faith.]—*Op.*, tom. i. col. 175. B.]—And A. C. tells us, p. 47: "To know that Scripture is Divine and infallible in every part, is a foundation so necessary, as, if it be doubtfully questioned, all the faith built upon Scripture falls to the ground." And he gives the same reason for it, p. 50. which Bellarmine doth.

[33] Spiritu [itaque Sancto] ecclesiam afflatam, certe credo; non ut veritatem auctoritatemve libris canonicis tribuat, sed ut doceat illos, non alios, esse canonicos. Nec si Ecclesia nobis aditum præbet ad hujusmodi sacros libros cognoscendos, protinus ibi acquiescendum est; sed ultra oportet progredi, et solida Dei veritate niti. Qua ex re intelligitur quid sibi voluerit Augustinus, cum ait, Evangelio non crederem, nisi [me Ecclesiæ moveret auctoritas. Therefore I firmly believe that the Church is inspired by the Holy Ghost; not that it may give truth and authority to the canonical books, but that it may teach these and none other as canonical. Now, if the Church gives us an entrance so that we know the holy books in this way, ought we to rest there; we ought to advance further, and base our faith on the solid truth of God. Thus, we understand what Augustine meant when he said, I shall not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Church persuaded me so to do.]—M. Canus, *de locis Theolog.* lib. ii. cap. 8. fol. 34. B. [See note 24.]—Non docet fundatam esse Evangelii fidem in Ecclesiæ auctoritate, verum [simpliciter nullam esse certam viam qua sive infideles, seu in fide novitii, ad sacros libros ingrediantur, nisi Ecclesiæ Catholicæ unum eundemque consensum. He does not teach that faith in the Gospel is founded on the authority of the Church, but that there is no other sure means by which heathen or novices in faith can approach the holy books, but the one united agreement of the Catholic Church.]—*Ibid.*

of human law."[34] And some among you,[35] not unworthy for their learning, prove it at large, "That all the Church's testimony, or voice, or sentence,"—call it what you will,—"is but *suo modo*, or *aliquo modo*, 'not simply, but in a manner,' divine." Yea, and A. C. himself, after all his debate, comes to that, and no further, "That the tradition of the Church is, at least in some sort, divine and infallible." Now, that which is divine but in a sort or manner, be it the Church's manner, is *aliquo modo non divina*, "in a sort not divine." But this great principle of faith, the ground and proof of whatsoever else is of faith, cannot stand firm upon a proof that is and is not—in a manner and not in a manner—divine; as it must, if we have no other anchor than the external tradition of the Church to lodge it upon, and hold it steady in the midst of those waves which daily beat upon it.

SECTION XVI.

A. C. p. 51.

VII. Now, here A. C. confesses expressly, "That to prove the books of Scripture to be divine, we must be warranted by that which is infallible." He confesses further, "That there can be no sufficient infallible proof of this, but God's word, written or unwritten." And he gives his reason for it: "Because if the proof be merely human and fallible, the science or faith which is built upon it can be no better." So then this is agreed on by me, (yet leaving other men to travel by their own way, so be they can come to make Scripture thereby infallible,) That Scripture must be known to be Scripture by a sufficient, infallible, divine proof. And that such proof can be nothing but the word of God, is agreed on also by me. Yea, and agreed on for me it shall be likewise, that God's word may be written and unwritten. For Cardinal Bellarmine[36] tells us truly, that it is not the writing or

A. C. p. 49.

A. C. p. 50.

A. C. p. 51.

[34] Hooker. [*Eccl. Polit.*] Book iii. chap. ix. [Sect. 2. *Works*, vol. i. p. 381. ed. Church and Paget.—"The greatest among the school divines (sc. Thom. Aquin. *Prim. Sec.* Quæst. xci. Art. 3.) studying how to set down by exact definition the nature of an human law, (of which nature all the Church's constitutions are,) found not which way better to do it than in these words: 'Out of the precepts of the law of nature, as out of certain common and undemonstrable principles, man's reason, etc.'"]

[35] Stapl. *Relect. Controv.* iv. Q[uæst.] iii. Art. 1. 2. [See note 24.]

[36] [Et similiter Apostolicæ traditiones non scriptæ eandem vim habent, quam Apostolicæ traditiones scriptæ, ut in Concil. Trident. Sess. iv. asseritur, et ratio est manifesta: nam] verbum Dei non est tale, nec habet ullam auctoritatem, quia scriptum est in membranis, sed quia a Deo profectum est, [vel immediate, ut sunt sermones Domini, vel mediantibus Apostolis, ut est decretum Apostolorum. *Act.* xv. And in like manner Apostolical traditions which are not written have the same force as Apostolical traditions which are written, as is asserted in the fourth Session of the Council of Trent, and the reason for this is obvious; for the word of God does not become His Word, nor does it gain any authority,

[CHAPTER III.] printing, that makes Scripture the word of God; but it is the prime unerring essential truth, God Himself uttering and revealing it to His Church, that makes it *verbum Dei*, "the word of God." And this word of God is uttered to men, either immediately by God Himself, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and so it was to the Prophets and Apostles; or mediately,—either by Angels, to whom God had spoken first, and so the law was given,[87] and so also the message was delivered to the Blessed Virgin,—or by the Prophets [38] and Apostles, and so the Scriptures were delivered to the Church. But their being written, gave them no authority at all in regard of themselves: written or unwritten, the word was the same. But it was written that it might be the better preserved,[89] and continued with the more integrity to the use of the Church, and the more faithfully in our memories.[40] And you

Gal. iii. [19].

Luke i. 30.

because it is written on parchment; but because it came from God, either directly, as in the case of the Lord's speeches, or through the medium of the Apostles, as in the case of the Apostolic decree, *Acts* xv.]—Bellarmin. *de verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv. cap. 2. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 167. B.]

[87] Lex ordinata per angelos in manu Mediatoris. [A law ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.]—*Gal.* iii. 19.

[38] "The Holy Ghost, etc., which spake by the prophets,"—in Symb. Nicen.

[39] Nam pseudoprophetæ etiam viventibus adhuc Apostolis, multas fingebant corruptelas, sub hoc prætextu et titulo, quasi ab Apostolis viva voce essent traditæ, et propter hanc ipsam causam Apostoli doctrinam suam cœperunt literis comprehendere, et Ecclesiis commendare. [For false prophets, even while the Apostles were still alive, forged many corruptions, using this pretext and this title that they were traditions taken from the Apostles' lips; and this was the very reason why the Apostles began to put their teaching in writing, and to give it to the charge of the Churches.]—Chem[nitii,] *Exam. Concil. Trid. de Traditionibus*, sub octavo genere Tradit. [par. 1. p. 76. col. 2. ed. Genev. 1614.]—And so also [Corn.] Jansen in *S. Johan.* v. 47. [*Com. in Concord. Evang.* cap. xxxvi. in fin. p. 249. ed. Lovan. 1571.] Sicut enim firmius est quod mandatur literis, ita est culpabilius et majus non credere scriptis, quam non credere verbis. [For just because what is commanded in writing is more certain, therefore it is more blameable and more definite to refuse to believe writings than words.]

[40] Labilis est memoria, et ideo indigemus Scriptura: Dicendum quod verum est, sed hoc non habet, nisi ex inundantia peccatorum. [Memory can fail, and therefore we want Scripture; we must speak what is true, but what is spoken we only receive through a number of sinners.]—Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* Part. 1. Art. viii. Q[uæst.] 4. [§ 10. tom. i. p. 166. ed. Ferrariæ, 1646. Cave says in his *History of Literature*, Vol. II. p. 326: This Henry, whose surname was Gœthals, was a Fleming by origin, was called a Gaul from his native place (Ghent), and flourished in the year 1280. He long taught philosophy and theology at the Sorbonne, and was so much admired as to get the name of "the Serious Doctor."]—Christus, voluntatem Suam de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diu duraturas. [Christ transferred His will from His heart which was to die on to papers which would last long.]—Optat. [Milevit. *de Schism. Donatist.*] lib. v. [cap. 3. *Op.*, p. 81. ed. Dupin.—*i.e.*] Christus Ipse non transtulit, sed ex Optati sententia, Ejus inspiratione, si non jussu, Apostoli transtulerunt. [It would not be true to say that Christ transferred this; but the mean-

have been often enough told, (were truth, and not the maintaining of a party, the thing you seek for,) that if you will show us any such unwritten word of God delivered by His prophets and Apostles, we will acknowledge it to be divine and infallible. So, written or unwritten, that shall not stumble us. But, then A. C. must not tell us, at least not think we shall swallow it into our belief, that everything which he says is the unwritten word of God, is so indeed.

VIII. I know Bellarmine hath written a whole book, *De verbo Dei non scripto*,[41] "of the Word of God not written," in which he handles the controversy concerning traditions. And the cunning is, to make his weaker readers believe, that all that which he and his are pleased to call traditions, are by and by no less to be received and honoured than the unwritten word of God ought to be. Whereas, it is a thing of easy knowledge, that the "unwritten word of God," and "tradition," are not convertible terms, that is, are not all one. For there are many unwritten words of God, which were never delivered over to the Church, for aught appears: and there are many traditions, affirmed, at least, to be such by the Church of Rome, which were never warranted by any unwritten word of God.

IX. First, that there are many unwritten words of God, which were never delivered over to the Church, is manifest. For when or where were the words which Christ spake to His apostles, during the "forty days" of His conversing with them after His resurrection, first delivered over to the Church? or what were the unwritten words He then spake? If neither He, nor His Apostles or Evangelists, have delivered them to the Church, the Church ought not to deliver them to her children. Or if she do *tradere non traditum*,[42] "make a tradition of that which was not delivered to her," and by some of them, then she is unfaithful to God, and doth not *servare depositum*, "faithfully keep that which is committed to her trust." And her sons, which come to know

Acts i. 3.

1 Tim. vi. 20.

2 Tim. i. 14.

ing of Optatus is that the Apostles transferred it by His inspiration, if not by His command.]

[41] Bellar. *de verbo Dei non scripto*, lib. iv.

[42] Annunciare aliquid Christianis Catholicis, præter id quod acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nusquam licet, nunquam licebit. [To proclaim to Catholic Christians anything beyond what they have received has never been allowable, is nowhere allowable, never will be allowable.]—Vincen. Lirin. cap. xiv. [p. 25.]—Et præcepit nihil aliud innovari, nisi quod traditum est. [And he commanded that there should be no additions to the faith but only what has been delivered.]—S. Cyprian. *ad Pompeium cont. Epist. Stephan.* [in] princip. [*Epist.* lxxiv. p. 138. ed. Benedict.]

[CHAPTER III.] it, are not bound to obey her tradition against the word of their Father.[43] For wheresoever Christ holds His peace, or that His words are not registered, I am of St. Augustine's[44] opinion, "No man may dare without rashness say they were these, or these." So, there were many unwritten words of God, which were never delivered over to the Church; and therefore never made tradition. And there are many traditions, which cannot be said to be the unwritten word of God. For, I believe, a learned Romanist, that will weigh before he speaks, will not easily say, That to anoint or use spittle in baptism; or to use three dippings in the use of that sacrament; or divers other like traditions, had their rise from any word of God unwritten. Or if he be so hardy as to say so, it is *gratis dictum*, and he will have enough to do to prove it. So there may be an unwritten word of God, which is no tradition. And there are many traditions, which are no unwritten word of God. Therefore Tradition must be taken two ways:—either, as it is the Church's act delivering, or the thing thereby delivered; and then it is human authority, or from it, and unable infallibly to warrant divine faith, or to be the object of it: or else as it is the unwritten word of God; and then wherever it can be made to appear so, it is of divine and infallible authority, no question. But then I
A. C. p. 49. would have A. C. consider where he is in this particular. He tells us, We must know infallibly, that the books of Holy Scripture are divine, and that this must be done by unwritten tradition, but so,

[43] Si ipsa [quidem] contraria Scripturæ diceret, ipsi non crederet. [If the Church herself were to say anything contrary to Scripture, a faithful Christian must not believe her.]—Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* Part. I. Art. x. Q[uæst.] I. [§ 10. tom. i. p. 183.]—And Bellarmine himself, that he might the more safely defend himself in the cause of traditions, says, (but how truly let other men judge:) Deinde commune est nec ullum traditionem admittimus contra Scripturam. [And it is common ground that we admit no tradition contrary to Scripture.]—Lib. iv. *de verbo Dei* [*non scripto*,] cap. 3. § 7. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 169. B.]

[44] S. Augustin. *in S. Johan. Evang.* [cap. xvi. 12.] Tractat. xcvi. in illa verba, Multa habeo [vobis] dicere, sed non potestis portare modo. [I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.—*Op.*, tom. iii. par. ii. col. 733. Migne, iii. 1874. Nunc ergo quæ ista sint, quæ Apostoli tunc portare non poterant, vultis forsitan scire. Sed quis nostrûm audeat eorum se dicere jam capacem, quæ illi capere non valebant? . . . Sed quænam sint ista quæ Ipse non dixit, temerarium est velle præsumere ac dicere. . . . Quæ cum Ipse tacuerit, quis nostrûm dicat, Ista vel illa sunt? Now therefore, you perhaps would like to know what the things were which the Apostles could not bear. But which of us shall dare to say I am capable of bearing and understanding what they were not. . . . But it would be rash to be so presumptuous as to wish to say what the things were which He did not say. . . . For since He was silent about them, which of us shall say they were this and that?]

as that this tradition is the word of God unwritten. Now, let him but prove that this, or any tradition which the Church of Rome stands upon, is the word of God, though unwritten, and the business is ended. But A. C. must not think, that because the tradition of the Church tells me these books are *verbum Dei*, "God's word"; and that I do both honour and believe this tradition; that therefore this tradition itself is God's word too, and so absolutely sufficient and infallible to work this belief in me. Therefore, for aught A. C. hath yet added, we must on with our inquiry after this great business, and most necessary truth.

Section XVI.

A. C. p. 52.

X. 2. For the second way of proving that Scripture should be fully and sufficiently known, as by "divine" and "infallible" testimony, *lumine proprio*, by the resplendency of that light which it hath in itself only, and by the witness that it can so give to itself, I could never yet see cause to allow. For as there is no place in Scripture that tells us, Such books, containing such and such particulars, are the Canon, and infallible will and word of God:[45] so, if there were any such place, that were no sufficient proof. For a man may justly ask another book to bear witness of that; and again of that, another; and wherever it were written in Scripture, that must be a part of the whole; and no created thing can alone give witness to itself, and make it evident; nor one part testify for another, and satisfy where Reason will but offer to contest; except those principles only of natural knowledge, which appear manifest by intuitive light of understanding, without any discourse: and yet they also to the weaker sort require induction preceding. Now this inbred light of Scripture is a thing coincident with Scripture itself: and so the principles and the conclusion in this kind of proof should be entirely the same, which cannot be. Besides, if this "inward light" were so clear, how could there

[45] Hooker, [*Eccl. Polit.*] book ii. ch. iv. [sect. 2. *Works*, vol. i. p. 295, ed. Church and Paget. "Finally, we all believe that the Scriptures of God are sacred, and that they have proceeded from God; ourselves we assure that we do right well in so believing. We have for this point a demonstration sound and infallible. But it is not the word of God which doth or possibly can assure us, that we do well to think it His word. For if any one book of Scripture did give testimony to all, yet still that Scripture which giveth credit to the rest, would require another Scripture to give credit unto it; neither could we ever come to any pause whereon to rest our assurance this way: so that unless besides Scripture there were something which might assure us that we do well, we could not think we do well, no, not in being assured that Scripture is a sacred and holy rule of well-doing."]

[CHAPTER III.]

have been any variety among the ancient believers touching the authority of St. James' and St. Jude's Epistles,[46] and the Apocalypse,[47] with other books which were not received for divers years after the rest of the New Testament? For, certainly the light which is in the Scripture was the same then which now it is. And how could the Gospel of St. Bartholomew, of St. Thomas, and other counterfeit pieces, obtain so much credit with some, as to be received into the Canon, if the evidence of this light were either universal or infallible, of, and by, itself? And this though I cannot approve, yet methinks you may, and upon probable grounds at least. For I hope no Romanist will deny,[48] but that there is as much light in Scripture, to manifest and make ostension of itself to be infallibly the written word of God, as there is in any tradition of the Church, that it is divine, and infallibly the unwritten word of God. And the Scripture saying from the mouths of the Prophets, "Thus saith the Lord," and from the mouths of the Apostles, that "the Holy Ghost spake by them," are at least as able and as fit to bear witness to their own verity, as the Church is to bear witness to her own traditions, by bare saying they come from the Apostles. And yourselves would never go to the Scripture to prove that there are traditions, as you do,[49] if you do not think the Scripture as easy to be discovered by "inbred light in itself," as traditions by their "light." And if this be so, then it is as probable at the least (which some of ours affirm) "That Scripture may be known to be the word of God by the light and lustre which it hath in itself," as it is (which you affirm), "That a tradition may be known to be such by the light which it hath in itself": which is an excellent proposition to make sport withal, were this an argument to be handled merrily.

Isa. xliv. 2. *et passim.* Acts xxviii. 25.

2 Thess. ii. 15. Jude, ver. 3.

[46] Euseb. [*Hist. Eccles.*] lib. ii. cap. 27. [in] fin. ed. Basil. 1549. [cap. 23. tom. i. p. 82. apud *Hist. Eccl. Script.* ed. Reading.]

[47] Euseb. [*Hist. Eccles.*] lib. iii. cap. 25. [tom. i. p. 119. apud *Hist. Eccl. Script.* ed. Reading.]

[48] Except A. C., whose boldness herein I cannot but pity. For he denies this "light" to the Scripture, and gives it to tradition. His words are (p. 52): "Tradition of the Church is of a company, which by its own light shows [showeth—A. C.] itself to be infallibly [infallibly—*caret* A. C.] assisted by Christ and His Holy Spirit, etc."

[49] In your Articles delivered to Dr. W[hite,] to be answered. ["Dr. White excepted against that part of the paper, wherein was said, That the word of God was partly written, partly unwritten, and would have nothing to be the word of God, but what is written in Scripture. Mr. Fisher, to justify that part of the paper, first alleged that text of St. Paul, Hold the traditions, etc."—The relation of the Conference, etc. p. 15.] And A. C. p. 52. [seu potius, p. 50.]

XI. 3. For the third opinion and way of proving, either some think that there is no sufficient warrant for this, unless they fetch it from the testimony of the Holy Ghost, and so look in vain after special revelations, and make themselves, by this very conceit, obnoxious, and easy to be led by all the whisperings of a "seducing private spirit"; or else you would fain have them think so. For your side,[50] both upon this and other occasions, do often challenge, "That we resolve all our faith into the dictates of a private Spirit"; from which we shall ever prove ourselves as free [as], if not freer than, you. To the question in hand then: Suppose it agreed upon that there must be a divine faith,[51] *cui subesse non potest falsum*, "under which can rest no possible error," that the books of Scripture are the written word of God: if they which go to the testimony of the Holy Ghost for proof of this, do mean by faith *objectum fidei*, "the object of faith" that is to be believed, then, no question, they are out of the ordinary way. For God never sent us by any word or warrant of His, to look for any such "special and private testimony" to prove which that book is, that we must believe. But if by faith they mean the habit, or act, of divine infused faith, by which virtue they do believe the credible object, and thing to be believed, then their speech is true, and confessed by all divines of all sorts. For faith is the "gift of God,"[52] of God alone, and an "infused habit,"[53] in

[50] A Jesuit, under the name of T. S. [J. S.] set out a book, anno 1630, which he called, "The Triall of the Protestant private Spirit." [The full title of this book is "The triall of the Protestant private Spirit: wherein their doctrine making the sayd Spirit the sole grounde and meanes of their beliefe is confuted . . . The Second Part which is doctrinal. Written by J. S. of the Society of Jesus. Permissu superiorum MDCXXX." Its author was J. Sergeant; and in a Preface he explains how "this Second Part gets birth and breath, and comes to light before the first."]

[51] Ut testimonia Scripturæ certam et indubitatam fidem præstent, necessarium videtur ostendere, quod ipsæ Divinæ Scripturæ sint Dei Spiritu inspiratæ. [In order that the evidence given by Scripture may procure us a sure and unhesitating faith, it seems necessary to show that the Holy Scriptures are themselves inspired by the Spirit of God.]--Origen. περὶ ἀρχῶν, lib. iv. [cap. 1. Rufin. interpret.—The Greek is however somewhat different. —*Op.*, tom. i. p. 156. ed. Benedict. Migne. i. 341. μαρτύρια τὰ ἐκ τῶν πεπιστευμένων ἡμῖν εἶναι θείων γραφῶν, τῆς τε λεγομένης παλαίας διαθήκης, καὶ τῆς καλουμένης καινῆς, λόγῳ τε πειρώμεθα κρατύνειν ἡμῶν τὴν πίστιν. There is evidence derived from the Scriptures which have been entrusted to us as divine, both from the Old and from the New Testament, and we try to strengthen our belief by reason.]

[52] *1 Cor.* xii. 3, 4. Datur nobis a Deo, etc. [It is given to us by God.] —S. Augustin. [*Enarr.*] *in Psalm.* lxxxvii. [*Op.*, tom. iv. col. 932. F. ed. Benedict. Migne, iv. 1116.]

[53] [Sed hoc est falsum], quia [cum] homo, assentiendo his quæ sunt fidei, elevetur supra naturam suam, oportet quod hoc insit ei ex supernaturali principio interius movente, quod est

[CHAPTER III.]

respect whereof the soul is merely recipient; and therefore the sole infuser the Holy Ghost, must not be excluded from that work, which none can do but He. For the Holy Ghost, as He first dictated the Scripture to the Apostles,[54] so did He not leave the Church in general, nor the true members of it in particular, without grace to believe what Himself had revealed and made credible.[55] So that faith, as it is taken for the virtue of faith, whether it be of this or any other article, though "it receive a kind of preparation, or occasion of beginning, from the testimony of the Church, as it proposeth and induceth to the faith; yet it ends in God, revealing within, and teaching within, that which the Church preached without."[56] For till the Spirit of God move

Deus: [But this is false, because, when a man, by assenting to those things which are of faith, is raised above his human nature, it is certain that this act of assent is caused by a supernatural principle moving within, which is God.] — Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] vi. A[rt.] 1. [in respons.]—And your own divines agree in this, that *fides acquisita* is not sufficient for any article, but there must be *fides infusa*, before there can be divine certainty. [Nec verus catholicus, quod nonnulli fingunt, assentitur huic, Ecclesia est verax, solum per] conjecturas humanas, acquisita fides innititur. Ad quem modum et Saraceni suis præceptoribus, et Judæi suis rabbinis, et Gentes suis philosophis, et omnes [denique] suis majoribus inhærent. Non sic, [inquam,] Christiani; sed per interius lumen infusum a Spiritu Sancto, quo firmissime et certissime moventur ad credendum, [ecclesiam Christianam errare non posse. Nor does a real Catholic, as some pretend, agree to this, "The Church is true," only by human guesses, on which he rests his acquired faith. In this way, the Saracens agree with their teachers, the Jews with their Rabbis, the Gentiles with their philosophers, and all with their predecessors. It is not so with Christians; they depend upon an inward light shed upon them by the Holy Spirit which most firmly and most surely moves them to believe that the Christian Church cannot err. —Melchior] Canus, *de loc. Theolog.* lib. ii. cap. 8. § Jam si hæc, [p. 59.]

[54] Symbol. Nicen. "The Holy Ghost, [Who] spake by the prophets," etc.—Et *1 Pet.* ii. 21.—[Tu itaque, regnator creaturæ tuæ,] quis est modus, quo doces animas ea quæ futura sunt? Docuisti enim prophetas Tuos. [And Thou also, Ruler of Thy creation, what is the means by which Thou teachest souls the things that shall be? For Thou has taught Thy prophets.] — S. Augustin. *Confess.* lib. xi. cap. 19. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 203. D.]

[55] Nec cum ecclesiæ testimonium aut judicium prædicamus, Dei Spiritum, vel ab ecclesia docente, vel a nobis audientibus, excludimus. Sed utrobique diserte includimus, etc.—[When we speak of the witness and decision of the Church, we do not exclude the Spirit of God whether from the Church which is the Teacher, or members who are the Scholars; but in every case we expressly include Him.]—Stapelton. *Triplicatio adversus Whitakerum*, [*pro ecclesiæ auctoritate*,] cap. iii. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 1142. C.]

[56] Fides quæ cœpit ab ecclesiæ testimonio, quatenus proponit et inducit ad fidem, desinit in Deo intus revelante et intus docente quod foris ecclesia prædicavit. [A faith which begins with the witness of the Church, as far as it teaches and leads on to faith, ends in God Who makes an inward revelation, and teaches to the heart what the Church taught to the ears.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] iv. [de potestat. Eccl. in se, Q[uæst.] iii. A[rt.] 2. [respons.

the heart of man, he cannot believe, be the object never so credible. The speech is true then, but quite out of the state of this question:[57] which inquires only after a sufficient means to make this object credible and fit to be believed, against all impeachment of folly and temerity in belief, whether men do actually believe it or not. For which no man may expect inward private revelation without the external means of the Church, unless perhaps the "case of necessity"[58] be excepted when a man lives in such a time and place as excludes him from all ordinary means: in which I dare not offer to shut up God from the souls of men, nor to tie Him to those ordinary ways and means to which yet in great wisdom and providence He hath tied and bound all mankind.

XII. Private revelation, then, hath nothing ordinarily to do, to make the object credible in this, That Scripture is the word of God or in any other article. For the question is of such outward and evident means, as other men may take notice of, as well as ourselves. By which, if there arise any doubting or infirmity in the faith, others may strengthen us, or we afford means to support them: whereas the testimony of the Spirit, and all private revelation is within, nor felt nor seen of any but him that hath it.[59] So

ad argum. hæret. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 755. A.]—["Neither can I think that] when grave and learned men do sometime hold, that of this principle there is no proof but by the testimony of the Spirit, [which assureth our hearts therein,] it is their meaning to exclude [utterly] all force [which any kind] of reason may have in that behalf; but [I] rather [incline to interpret such their speeches, as if they had more expressly set down,] that other motives and inducements, [be they never so strong and consonant with reason,] are [notwithstanding] uneffectual of themselves to work faith [concerning this principle], if the special grace of the Holy Spirit concur not [to the enlightening of our minds."]—Hooker, [*Eccl. Polit.*] book iii. ch. viii. [sect. 15. *Works*, vol i. p. 377, ed. Church and Paget.

[57] De habitu fidei quoad fieri ejus et generationem, quum a Deo immediate solo dono gratuito infusus est, nihil ad quæstionem, nisi quoad hoc quod per Scripturæ inspectionem, etc. [As to the character of faith and how its beginning is made, since it is imparted by God immediately, entirely, and out of His grace, that is not our subject here, except in so far as we can achieve it by an examination of Scripture.]—Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* [part. i.] A[rt.] x. Q[uæst.] 1. D. [§ 7. tom. i. p. 182.]

[58] Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* iv. Quæst. iii. Art. ii. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 755. A. B., *ubi sup.* note 56.] doth not only affirm it, but proves it too, *a paritate rationis*, in case of necessity, where there is no contempt of the external means.

[59] Quid cum singulis agatur, Deus scit qui agit, atque ipsi, cum quibus agitur, sciunt. Quid autem agatur cum genere humano, per historiam commendari voluit, et per prophetiam. [How individuals are affected, God knows who affects them and they themselves who are affected. How the human race is affected can be understood by history and by prophecy.]—S. Augustin. *de vera Relig.* cap. xxv. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 763. D.]

[CHAPTER III.]

that hence can be drawn no proof to others. And miracles are not sufficient alone to prove it, unless both they, and the revelation too, agree with the rule of Scripture, which is now an unalterable rule by man or angel. To all this A. C. says nothing save, "that I seem not to admit of an infallible impulsion of a private Spirit, *ex parte subjecti*, without any infallible reason, and that sufficiently applied, *ex parte objecti*, which if I did admit, would open a gap to all enthusiasms, and dreams of fanatical men." Now for this yet I thank him. For I do not only "seem not to admit," but I do most clearly reject, this frenzy in the words going before.

Gal. i. 8.

A. C. p. 52.

XIII. 4. The last way, which gives reason leave to come in, and prove what it can,[60] may not justly be denied by any reasonable man. For though reason without grace cannot see the way to heaven, nor believe this book, in which God hath written the way; yet grace is never placed but in a reasonable creature, and proves by the very seat which it hath taken up, that the end it hath is to be spiritual eye-water, to make reason see what by "nature only it cannot,"[61] but never to blemish reason in that which it can, "comprehend." Now the use of reason is very general; and man, do what he can, is still apt to search and seek for a reason why he will believe; though, after he once believes, his faith grows stronger than either his reason or his knowledge:[62]

[60] Utitur tamen sacra doctrina [etiam] ratione humana, non quidem ad probandum fidem ipsam, [quia per hoc tolleretur meritum fidei,] sed ad manifestandum aliqua alia, quæ traduntur in hac doctrina. [The sacred teaching however makes use of human reason, not indeed to prove faith itself, for in this way the merit of faith would be done away, but to make clear certain other points which are delivered in its teaching.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 8. ad Secundum. [Migne, i. 467.]—Passibus *rationis* novus homo tendit in Deum. [By the steps of reason the new man goes towards God.]—[inquit] S. Augustin. *de vera Relig.* cap. xxvi. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 764. F.] passibus, verum est, sed nec æquis, nec solis. [By its steps it is true, yet neither equal steps, nor without help.] Invisibilia Dei altiori modo, quantum ad plura, percipit fides, quam ratio naturalis ex creaturis in Deum procedens. [The invisible secrets of God, in the majority of cases are understood in a loftier fashion by faith, than by natural reason climbing up to God through His creatures.]—Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] ii. A[rt. 3. respons.] ad Tertium. [Migne, iii. 31.]

[61] Animalis homo non percipit. [The natural man does not perceive.]—*1 Cor.* ii. 14.

[62] Quia [aliæ] scientiæ certitudinem habent ex naturali lumine rationis humanæ, quæ potest errare: [hæc autem, sc.] Theologia, certitudinem habet ex lumine divinæ scientiæ, quæ decipi non potest. [Because they attain the certainty of other knowledge by the natural light of reason which can be mistaken; but Theology (which teaches both the object and the knowledge of faith), as well as faith itself, gains its certainty by the light of divine knowledge which cannot be mistaken.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*]

and great reason for this, because it goes higher, and so upon a safer principle, than either of the other can in this life. Section XVI.

XIV. In this particular the books called the Scripture are commonly and constantly reputed to be the word of God, and so infallible verity to the least point of them. Doth any man doubt this? The world cannot keep him from going to weigh it at the balance of reason, whether it be the word of God or not. To the same weights he brings the tradition of the Church, the inward motives in Scripture itself, all testimonies within, which seem to bear witness to it; and in all this there is no harm: the danger is when a man will use no other scale but reason, or prefer reason before any other scale. For the word of God, and the book containing it, refuse not to be weighed by reason.[63] But the scale is not large enough to contain, nor the weights to measure out, the

par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 5. [in respons. Migne, i. 462.]—Ut, ipsa fide valentiores facti, quod credimus intelligere mereamur, [non jam hominibus, sed ipso Deo intrinsecus mentem nostram illuminante atque firmante? So that, made stronger by faith itself, we may deserve to understand what we believe: not now by the agency of man, but by God Himself inwardly illuminating and strengthening our minds.]—S. Augustin. *contra Epistolam Manichæi, quam vocant Fundamenti*, cap. xiv. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 160. D.] — Hoc autem ita intelligendum est, ut scientia certior sit certitudine evidentiæ; fides vero certior firmitate adhæsionis. Majus lumen in scientia, majus robur in fide: et hoc, quia in fide, et ad fidem actus imperatus voluntatis concurrit. Credere enim est actus intellectus vero assentientis productus [procedens] ex voluntatis imperio. [But this must be understood in this way, that knowledge can grow stronger by the certainty of the evidence furnished, but faith grows stronger by the strength of our adherence to it. In knowledge more light; in faith more strength. And this happens because in faith and towards faith a commanded act of the will concurs to give help. For to believe is the act of the intellect truly assenting, and this is produced by the force of the will.—Gabr.] Biel. in III. *Sentent.* Distinct. xxiii. Quæst. ii. Art. 1. [These are not, except in portions, the exact words of Gabriel Biel, but rather an account of his whole argument.] — Unde Thom. [Aquin. inquit.] Intellectus credentis determinatur ad unum, non per rationem, sed per voluntatem; et ideo assensus hic accipitur pro actu intellectus, secundum quod a voluntate determinatur ad unum. [Wherefore Thomas Aquinas says: "the intellect of the believer is set in harmony, not by the reason but by the will: and therefore this assent is accepted as an act of the intellect, because it is set in harmony by the will.]—*Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] ii. A[rt.] 1. [Migne, iii. 29.]

[63] Si vobis, *rationi* et veritati consentanea videntur, in pretio habete, etc., de mysteriis religionis. [If they seem to you agreeable to the reason and to truth, prize them highly, etc.; I speak of the mysteries of religion.] —Justin. Martyr. [*Apolog.* Prim. cap.] ii. [These words do not seem to be an exact translation of Justin Martyr, but an account of the general argument of the exordium of his first Apology.]—Igitur, si fuit dispositio *rationis*. [Therefore if there was an inclination of the reason.]—Tertull. lib. *de Carne Christi*, cap. xviii. C. [*Op.*, p. 321. ed. Rigalt. Migne, ii. 783.]—Rationabile est credere Deum esse autorem Scripturæ. [It is reasonable to believe that God is the author of revelation.]—Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* tom. i. Art. ix. Q[uæst.] 3.

[CHAPTER III.]

true virtue and full force of either. Reason, then, can give no supernatural ground into which a man may resolve his faith, That Scripture is the word of God infallibly: yet Reason can go so high, as it can prove that Christian religion, which rests upon the authority of this book, stands upon surer grounds of nature, reason, common equity, and justice, than anything in the world which any infidel or mere naturalist hath done, doth or can adhere unto, against it, in that which he makes, accounts, or assumes as religion to himself.

XV. The ancient Fathers relied upon the Scriptures, no Christians more: and, having to do with philosophers (men very well seen in all the subtilties which natural reason could teach or learn), they were often put to it, and did as often make it good, that they had sufficient warrant to rely, so much as they did, upon Scripture. In all which disputes, because they were to deal with infidels, they did labour to make good the authority of the book of God by such arguments as unbelievers themselves could not but think reasonable, if they weighed them with indifferency. For though I set the mysteries of faith above reason, which is their proper place; yet I would have no man think they contradict reason, or the principles thereof. No sure: for reason by her own light can discover how firmly the principles of religion are true; but all the light she hath will never be able to find them false. Nor may any man think that the principles of religion, even this, That Scriptures are the word of God, are so indifferent to a natural eye, that it may with as just cause lean to one part of the contradiction as to the other. For though this truth, That Scripture is the word of God, is not so demonstratively evident *a priori*, as to enforce assent; yet it is strengthened so abundantly with probable arguments, both from the light of nature itself and human testimony, that he must be very wilful and self-conceited that shall dare to suspect it.

XVI. Nay, yet further,[64] It is not altogether impossible to prove it, even by reason, a truth infallible, or else to make them

[64] Hooker, [*Eccl. Polit.*] book. iii. ch. viii. [sect. 14. *Works*, vol. i. pp. 376, 377, ed. Church and Paget. "If infidels or atheists chance at any time to call it in question, this giveth us occasion to sift what reason there is, whereby the testimony of the Church concerning Scripture, and our own persuasion which Scripture itself hath confirmed, may be proved a truth infallible. In which case the ancient Fathers being often constrained to shew, what warrant they had so much to rely upon the Scripture, endeavoured still to maintain the authority of the books of God by arguments such as unbelievers themselves must needs think reasonable, if they judged thereof as they

deny some apparent principle of their own. For example: It is an apparent principle, and with them, That God, or the absolute prime agent, cannot be forced out of any possession; for if He could be forced by another greater, He were neither prince, nor absolute, nor God,[65] in their own theology. Now they must grant, That that God and Christ, which the Scripture teaches, and we believe, is the only true God, and no other with Him, and so deny the Deity which they worshipped, or else deny their own principles about the Deity, That God cannot be commanded and forced out of possession. For[66] "their gods, Saturn, and Serapis, and Jupiter himself, have been adjured by the name of the true and only God, and have been forced out of the bodies they possessed, and confessed themselves to be foul and seducing devils; and their confession was to be supposed true in point of reason; for they that were adored as gods, would never belie themselves into devils, to their own reproach, especially in the presence of them that worshipped them, were they not forced." This many of the unbelievers saw: therefore they could not, in very force of reason, but they must either deny their God, or deny their principle in nature. Their long custom would not forsake

should. Neither is it a thing impossible, or greatly hard, even by such kind of proofs so to manifest and clear that point, that no man living shall be able to deny it, without denying some apparent principle such as all men acknowledge to be true."]—Si [enim] Plato ipse viveret, et me interrogantem non aspernaretur, [vel potius, si quis ejus discipulus, eo ipso tempore quo vivebat, eum interrogaret, etc. If Plato himself were alive, and did not despise my questions; or rather if some disciple of his, what time he was alive, should ask him.]—S. Augustin. *de vera Relig.* cap. iii. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 748. C.]—*Ibid.* cap. xxix. [col. 766. A.]

[65] Si vim spectes, Deus valentissimus est. If you look to force, God is the strongest of all. Aristot. *de Mundo*, cap. vii. [Ταῦτα χρὴ καὶ περὶ θεοῦ διανοεῖσθαι, δυνάμει μὲν ὄντος ἰσχυροτάτου, κάλλει δὲ εὐπρεπεστάτου, κ.τ.λ. [It is important also to understand these points about God; He is strongest in power, He is the most noble in beauty.—*Op.*, tom. iii. p. 152. ed. Bekker.]—Domini et Moderatores omnium. Lords and masters of all things.—Cic. *de Leg.* [lib.] ii. [cap. 7.]

[66] Ipse Saturnus, et Serapis, et Jupiter, et quicquid Dæmonum colitis, victi dolore, quod sunt, eloquuntur. Nec utique in turpitudinem sui, nonnullis præsertim vestrorum assistentibus, mentiuntur. Ipsis testibus esse eos Dæmonas de se verum confitentibus credite. Adjurati enim per Deum verum et solum, inviti, [miseri, corporibus inhorrescunt.—Great Saturn and Serapis and Jupiter and all the rest of the Dæmons you worship confess what they are—conquered by suffering. Nor do they lie about their own base condition; at such confessions some of your own friends have actually been present. Trust their own evidence that they are Dæmons, for they themselves confess this is true. For when they are adjured by the true and only God, in unwilling misery their bodies shudder.]—Arnob. viii. *contra Gent.*; or Minutius Felix, as is now thought: [sc. *in Dialogo Min. Fel. qui inscribitur Octavius*, cap. viii. p. 253. ed. Lugd. Bat. 1672. This was a very favourite argument of the early Apologists.]

[CHAPTER III.] their God, and their reason could not forget their principle. If reason therefore might judge among them, they could not worship anything that was under command. And if it be reasonable to do and believe this, then why not reasonable also to believe, That Scripture is His Word, given to teach Himself and Christ, since there they find Christ "doing that," and "giving power to do it after," which themselves saw executed upon their devil-gods?

Matt. xii. 22.
Mark xvi. 27.

XVII. Besides, whereas all other written laws have scarce had the honour to be duly observed, or constantly allowed worthy approbation, in the particular places where they have been established for laws; this law of Christ, and this canon of Scripture, the container of it, is, or hath been, received in almost all nations under heaven;[67] and wheresoever it hath been received, it hath been both approved for unchangeable good, and believed for infallible verity. This persuasion could not have been wrought in men of all sorts, but by working upon their reason, unless we shall think all the world unreasonable that received it. And certainly God did not give this admirable faculty of reasoning to the soul of man for any cause more prime than this, to discover, or to judge and allow, within the sphere of its own activity, and not presuming further, of the way to Himself, when and howsoever it should be discovered.

XVIII. One great thing that troubled rational men, was that

[67] Libros, [qui] quoquo modo se habeant, sancti tamen divinarum [que] rerum pleni prope totius generis humani confessione diffamantur. [Books which, whatever they profess to be, are spread abroad among almost the whole human race and are considered to be holy and full of divine matters.]—S. Augustin. *de utilitat. credendi*, cap. vii. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 56. B.]—Scriptura summæ dispositione providentiæ, super omnes omnium gentium literas, omnia sibi genera ingeniorum humanorum divina excellens authoritate subjecit. [The Scripture by the arrangement of divine providence has taken rank above all the literature of all the nations, has excelled by its divine origin every kind of human ability, and subdued everything by its authority.]—S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xi. cap. i. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 271. D. Migne, vii. 315.]—At [vero] in omni orbe terrarum, in Græcia, atque universis [exteris] nationibus, innumeri sunt et immensi, qui relictis patriis legibus, [et his quos putabant Deos,] ad observantiam Moysis [legis et discipulatum se] Christi [cultumque tradiderunt.]—Origen. [Rufin. interpret.] lib. iv. περὶ ἀρχῶν, cap. i. [πᾶσα δὲ Ἑλλὰς καὶ βάρβαρος ἡ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἡμῶν, ζηλῶτας ἔχει μυρίους, καταλιπόντας τοὺς πατρῴους νόμους καὶ νομιζομένους θεούς, τῆς τηρήσεως τῶν Μωσέως νόμων, καὶ τῆς μαθητείας τῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγων. All Hellas and all heathendom which belongs to our world contains many myriads of men, who have abandoned their ancestral laws and their supposed gods, and have become zealous observers of the laws of Moses, and of the doctrine of Jesus Christ.—*Op.*, tom. i. p. 157. ed. Benedict. Migne, i. 344.]

which stumbled the Manichee,[68] (an heresy it was, but more than half pagan,) namely, That somewhat must be believed, before much could be known. Wise men use not to believe, but what they know; and the Manichee[69] scorned the orthodox Christian as light of belief, promising to lead no disciple after him, but upon evident knowledge. This stumbled many: but yet the principle, That somewhat must be believed before much can be known, stands firm in reason still. For, if in all sciences there be some principles which cannot be proved; if reason be able to see this, and confess it; if almost all artists have granted it; if in the mathematics, where are the exactest demonstrations, there be *quædam postulata*, some things to be first demanded and granted, before the demonstration can proceed; who can justly deny that to Divinity, a science of the highest object, God Himself, which he easily and reasonably grants to inferior sciences, which are more within his reach? And as all sciences suppose some principles without proving, so have they almost all some text, some authority, upon which they rely in some measure: and it is reason they should. For though these sciences make not their texts infallible, as Divinity doth; yet full consent, and prudent examination, and long continuance, have won reputation to them, and settled reputation upon them, very deservedly. And were these texts more void of truth than they are, yet it were fit and reasonable to uphold their credit, that novices and young beginners in a science, which are not able to work strongly upon reason, nor reason upon them, may have authority to believe, till they can learn to conclude from principles, and so to know. Is this also reasonable in other sciences, and shall it not be so in Theology, to have a text, a Scripture, a rule, which novices may be taught first to believe, that so they may after come to the knowledge of those things, which out of this rich principle and treasure are deducible?[70] I yet see not how right reason can deny these

[68] [Mani, their founder, was an Eastern philosopher, who combined Christianity with Eastern Philosophy and taught of two equal potent powers, the Good Spirit and the Evil Spirit, contending for the rule of the world. Mani was put to death by the King of Persia *circa* 277. Augustine was for a long time a Manichee.]

[69] Irridere in Catholicæ Fidei disciplina, quod juberentur homines credere, non autem [quid esset verum certissima ratione docerentur. I know that he mocked at the teaching of the Catholic faith, because men were commanded to believe, but were not taught the truth by the sure proof of reason.]—S. Augustin. *Retractat.* lib. i. cap. 14. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 21. E.]

[70] And therefore S. Augustin. *de doct. Christ.* lib. ii. cap. viii. would have men make themselves perfect in

grounds; and if it cannot, then a mere natural man may be thus far convinced, That the text of God is a very credible text.

XIX. Well, these are the four ways, by most of which men offer to prove the Scripture to be the word of God, as by a divine and infallible warrant. And, it seems, no one of these doth it alone. (1.) The tradition of the present Church is too weak, because that is not absolutely divine. (2.) The light, which is in Scripture itself, is not bright enough; it cannot bear sufficient witness to itself. (3.) The testimony of the Holy Ghost, that is most infallible, but ordinarily is not so much as considerable in this question; which is not, how, or by what means, we believe, but how the Scripture may be proposed as a credible object, fit for belief. (4.) And for reason, no man expects that that should prove it: it doth service enough, if it enable us to disprove that which misguided men conceive against it. If none of these, then, be an absolute and sufficient means to prove it, either we must find out another, or see what can be more wrought out of these. And to all this again, A. C. says nothing.

reading the letter of the Scripture, even before they understood it. [Erit igitur divinarum Scripturarum sollertissimus indagator, qui primo totas legerit,] notasque habuerit; et si nondum intellectu, [jam] tamen lectione, duntaxat [eas quæ appellantur Canonicæ. The most accomplished investigator of the holy Scriptures will be the man who has first read the whole of them, and got to know them; even if his knowledge is attained not at first by the intellect, but by merely reading the books which are called Canonical.—*Op.*, tom. iii. par. i. col. 23. C. Migne, iii. 40.] No question but to make them ready against they understood it; and as schoolmasters make their scholars con their grammar rules by heart, that they may be ready for their use, when they better understand them.

[CHAPTER IV.

The office of the Church is to guide men to the Scriptures.

One of the arguments on which Laud has relied in the last chapter for the proof of the Divine authority of Scripture is the witness of the Holy Ghost within us. He has, however, carefully guarded himself. He sees this argument is very dangerous, if used by itself and as sufficient in itself. It was the argument on which Cromwell and Vane and Harrison, the three most striking figures in the Puritan conquest of the English Church, were to rely; and which they were to push to such dangerous lengths. Already in 1639, only a few months before the meeting of the Long Parliament, this party was coming into sight.

Laud balances the perilous argument from the inward inspiration of the individual believer, and the equally perilous argument from the voice of an existing infallible Church, which is at last to be reduced to the voice of one existing infallible man sitting in the Papal Chair, with two arguments from Natural Reason, viz. (1) That the effect of the Books of Scripture has been most extraordinary on the nations which received them; and (2) That every reasonable man is obliged to give homage to the revelation of God, which is made evident to him when he studies Scripture. He now continues the analysis of the position of the Church in the establishment of the Canon of Scripture.

Summary of Argument.

When we speak of the Church we must distinguish. The voice of the prime Church, which included the Apostles, is divine, and it is to this St. Augustine alludes in his words, "I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me." But the present Church is not purely divine. Its work is to undertake the duty of inducing men to believe and to study the Scriptures. Then the man who reads will believe for himself; since "Thy word

[CHAPTER IV.] *is a light"—unless indeed his eyes be blind or he be perverse. Hooker's view of the matter is next explained; and then Fisher's claim is attacked that all assurance must rest on the testimony of the Roman Bishop and his Clergy, who Laud answers have erred seriously in many things. Fisher pleads danger that copies of the Bible may be corrupted if there is no infallible referee; Laud answers that for this infallibility is not required; critical scholarship will be sufficient.*

But finally Fisher quotes the promise of Christ to be always with His Church, made quite as much to the doctors and pastors of the present Church as to the Apostles. Laud points out that such an argument would claim infallibility for every teacher and preacher. He examines the passages which are used to establish the argument; (1) St. Luke x. 16; (2) St. Matt. xxviii. 19 and 20; and (3) St. John xiv. 16; and argues that none of them promise a perpetual infallibility. He will not allow tradition to be equal with Scripture, nor the authority of God's minister to be equal with the authority of God's Word. Augustine and Vincent of Lerins put Scripture above tradition: the Schoolmen interpret the story of the Samaritans believing first because of the woman's word, then because they have heard Him themselves, as a type of the advance from faith which rests on the Church to faith which rests on the Word. No doubt tradition is the key that lets men into the Scriptures, and is thus of inestimable value as porteress, but it is not queen.]

XX. For the tradition of the Church, then, certain it is, we must distinguish the Church, before we can judge right of the validity of the tradition. For if the speech be of the prime Christian Church, the Apostles, disciples, and such as had immediate revelation from heaven; no question, but the voice and tradition of this Church is divine, not *aliquo modo*, "in a sort," but simply; and the word of God from them is of like validity, written or delivered. And against this tradition, of which kind this, That the books of Scripture are the word of God, is the most general and uniform, the Church of England never excepted. And when St. Augustine[1] said, "I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church

[1] [Evangelium mihi fortasse lecturus es, et inde Manichæi personam tentabis asserere. Si ergo invenires aliquem, qui Evangelio nondum credit, quid faceres dicenti tibi, Non credo?] Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoverit auctoritas. [Perhaps you will read me the Gospel, and try thence to derive the personality of Manichaeus. Well, suppose you find some one who does not yet accept the Gospel, what will you do when he says to you, I do not believe this? I, certainly, should not believe the Gospel, unless I was moved to it by the Catholic Church.]—S. Augustin. *contra Epistolam* [*Manichæi, quam vocant*] *Fund*[*amenti*,] cap. v. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 153, 154. G. A.]

moved me," which place you urged at the Conference, though you are now content to slide by it, some of your own will not endure it should be understood, save of the Church in the time of the Apostles[2] only; and some, of the Church in general, not

[2] Ockam. *Dialog.* part. i. cap. 4. [apud Goldast. *Monarch. S. Rom. Imp.* tom. ii. p. 402. ed. Francof. 1614.] Intelligitur solum de Ecclesia quæ fuit tempore Apostolorum. [It is understood of that Church only which existed in the days of the Apostles.—Ockam's words are: Aliquando vero nomen Ecclesiæ non solum totam congregationem catholicorum viventium, sed etiam fideles mortuos comprehendit. Et isto modo ultimo . . . accipit nomen Ecclesiæ Augustin. cum asserit, quod Non crederet Evangelium, etc. Ista enim Ecclesia scriptores Evangelii et omnes Apostolos comprehendit. But sometimes under the head of the Church are included not only the whole congregation of living Catholics, but also the faithful departed. And in that meaning only, Augustine used the word Church when he says, "I should not believe the Gospel," etc., for that Church includes the writers of the Gospel and all the Apostles.—T. C. (*i.e.* Thorold the Jesuit,) in his reply to the present work, published under the title: "*Labyrinthus Cantuariensus*; or Dr. Laud's Labyrinth, Paris, 1658." p. 78.; complains of Laud for saying "some," and quoting only Ockam. Stillingfleet in his reply to T. C. "*A rational account of the grounds of the Protestant religion: being a vindication of the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's Relation of a Conference, from the pretended answer by T. C.*," part i. ch. 6. sect. 19. *Works*, vol. iv. p. 191. ed. 1709. adds the following passage from Gerson: "Et hic aperitur modus intelligendi illud Augustini, Evangelio non crederem, etc. Ibidem enim Ecclesiam sumit pro primitiva congregatione fidelium eorum, qui Christum viderunt, audierunt, et sui testes extiterunt. And here is cleared up Augustine's expression, 'I should not believe the Gospel,' etc. For the Church there is the primitive congregation of faithful men who saw and heard Christ, and stood forth to be His witnesses.—Joh. Gerson. Lect. ii. *de vita spirituali*, ad coroll. 7." (*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 24. C. ed. Dupin. Antwerp. 1706.) And with respect to the passage from Ockam, in which, as Thorold rightly remarks, (p. 79.) "having perused it very diligently, there are neither those words cited (by Laud), nor anything like them," Stillingfleet (*ibid.*) answers satisfactorily that, "In Durandus we have those very words, which his Lordship by a lapse of memory attributes to Ockam; for Durandus plainly says: Hoc autem quod dictum est de approbatione Scripturæ per Ecclesiam, intelligitur solum de Ecclesia quæ fuit tempore Apostolorum, qui fuerunt repleti Spiritu Sancto. But what is said about the proof of Scripture by the Church is understood of that Church only which existed in the days of the Apostles, who were filled with the Holy Ghost.—Durand. lib. iii. Distinct. xxiv. Quæst. i. Sect. 9." (fol. ccxc. col. 3. ed. Paris. 1508.) And to the objection urged by Thorold, that the passage from Ockam, "doth speak, not of the Apostolic Church only, but of the Church in all ages, comprehending the Apostles and Evangelists in it," Stillingfleet (*ibid.* p. 192.) answers, "What advantage this is to your cause I cannot imagine. . . . For they who speak of the Church in that comprehensive sense, do only suppose the infallibility to have been in the primitive Apostolical Church, but the successive Church to be only the channel of conveyance of that testimony down to us; and so they say no more than we do. Thus Driedo expounds that place of Augustine: Augustinus cum dicit, Ego Evangelio non crederem, etc., intelligit de Ecclesia Catholica, quæ fuit ab initio Christianæ fidei, secundum seriem successionis Episcoporum crescens, ad hæc usque tempora, quæ sane Ecclesia complectitur collegium Apostolorum. When Augustine says, 'I should not believe the Gospel,' etc., he means the Catholic Church which existed from the foundation of the Christian faith, according

[CHAPTER IV.] excluding after ages.[3] But sure to include Christ and His Apostles. And the certainty is there, abundance of certainty in itself; but how far that is evident to us shall after appear.

XXI. But this will not serve your turn. The tradition of the present Church must be as infallible as that of the primitive. But the contrary to this is proved before,[4] because this voice of the present Church is not simply divine. To what end, then, serves any tradition of the present Church? To what? Why, to a very good end. For, first, it serves by a full consent to work upon the minds of unbelievers, to move them to read and to consider the Scripture, which (they hear by so many wise, learned, and devout men) is of no meaner esteem than the word of God. And, secondly, it serves among novices, weaklings, and doubters in the faith, to instruct and confirm them, till they may acquaint themselves with, and understand, the Scripture, which the Church delivers as the word of God. And thus, again, some of your own understand the fore-cited place of St. Augustine, "I would not believe the Gospel," etc. For he speaks it either of novices, or doubters in the faith, or else of such as were in part infidels.[5] You, at the Conference, though you omit it here, would needs have it, that St. Augustine spake even of the faithful;[6]

to the line of Episcopal Succession, growing till this time; and that Church notably embraces the College of Apostles.—Driedo, (*de Eccl. Script. et Dogmatib.*) tom. i. lib. iv. cap. 4." (*De dogmat. var. et apocryph.* p. 564. ed. Lovan. 1533.)]

[3] [Gabrielis] Biel, [sacræ theosophiæ licentiati nostræ tempestatis profundissimi, sacri] canonis missæ [tam mystica quam litteralis expositio, etc. Lect. xxii. [fol. xxx. ed. Johan. Cleyn. Lugd. 1514.] *a tempore Christi et Apostolorum.* [In this lecture on the words of the Canon, "In primis quæ tibi offerimus pro tota tua Ecclesia sancta," Biel is explaining the various acceptations of the term Ecclesia, and he argues that as the Evangelist is part of the Church, and the whole greater than a part, so the authority of the Church is greater than that of the Evangelist.]—And so doth St. Augustine take *Ecclesia*, [in his treatise] *contra* [*Epistol.*] *Fundam.* [*ubi supra.*]

[4] [*Ubi sup.*] sect. xvi. no. 6.

[5] Sive infideles, sive in fide novitii. [Either heathen or novices in the faith.] —Melch. Canus, *de loc. Theolog.* lib. ii. cap. 8. [pp. 59, 60.]—Neganti aut nescienti omnino Scripturam. [To a man who rejects or is absolutely ignorant of the Scripture.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] iv. [De potestate ecclesiæ in se,] Quæst. i. art. 3. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 736.]

[6] Quid si fateamur fideles etiam ecclesiæ auctoritate commoveri, ut Scripturas recipiant? Non tamen inde sequitur eos hoc modo penitus persuaderi, aut nulla alia fortioreque ratione induci. Quis autem Christianus est, quem Ecclesia Christi, commendans scripturam Christi, non commoveat? [Aliud autem est commoveri, aliud persuaderi? Supposing we admit that the faithful also are influenced by the authority of the Church to receive Scripture, it does not follow that it is only this which persuades them, nor that they have no further and no stronger reason. For what Christian can you find who is not moved by the Church of Christ when it commends to his attention Christ's Scripture. It is one thing to be moved, another thing to be per-

which I cannot yet think: for he speaks to the Manichees, and they had a great part of the infidel in them.[7] And the words immediately before these are, "If thou shouldst find one *qui Evangelio nondum credit*, which did not yet believe the Gospel, what wouldst thou do to make him believe? *Ego vero non*, Truly I would not," etc. So to these two ends it serves, and there need be no question between us. But, then, everything that is the first inducer to believe, is not by and by either the principal motive or the chief and last object of belief, upon which a man may rest his faith. Unless we shall be of Jacobus Almain's opinion, that we are *per prius et magis*, "first and more bound," to believe the Church than the Gospel.[8] Which your own learned men, as you may see by Mel[chior] Canus,[9] reject as extreme foul; and so indeed it is. The first knowledge, then, after the *quid nominis* is known by grammar, that helps to open a man's understanding, and prepares him to be able to demonstrate a truth, and make it evident, is his logic: but when he hath made a demonstration, he resolves the knowledge of his conclusion, not into his grammatical or logical principles, but into the immediate principles out of which it is deduced. So in this particular a man

suaded.] — Whitaker. *Disputat. de Sacra Scriptura*, Controv. I. Quæst. iii. cap. 8. ubi citat locum hunc S. Augustini, [sc. *in Epist. contra Fund.*, *ubi sup.* note 1. p. 94. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 325. ed. Aurel. Allobrog. et Genev. 1610.—Cf. his reply to Stapleton, etc. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 310. et seq.]

[7] Quibus [ergo] obtemperavi dicentibus, Credite Evangelio, [cur eis non obtemperem dicentibus mihi, Noli credere Manichæis? Why should I not again obey the people, who I had obeyed when they said to me, Believe the Scripture, when they say to me, Do not believe the Manichæans? —S. Augustin.] *ibid.* [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 154. A.] Therefore he [St. Augustine] speaks of himself, when he did not believe.

[8] Certum est quod tenemur credere omnibus contentis in sacro canone: quia ecclesia credit ex ea ratione solum. Ergo per prius et magis tenemur credere ecclesiæ, quam evangelio. [There is no doubt that we are obliged to believe everything contained in the Sacred Canon, because the Church believes, and for that reason only. Thus we are more bound to believe the Church than the Gospel.]—[Jac.] Almain. in III. [*Sentent.*] Dist. xxiv. [Quæst. unic.] Conclus. 6. Dub. 6. And to make a show of proof for this, he falsifies St. Augustine most notoriously, and reads that known place, not, Nisi me commoveret (persuaded), as all read it, but compelleret (compelled). Patet, quia dicit Augustinus, evangelio non crederem, nisi ad hoc me compelleret ecclesiæ auctoritas. [It is clear that Augustine says, I should not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Church compelled me so to do.—*Opuscula*, fol. lxxix. s. a. Par. 1517?]—*Ibid.* And so also Gerson reads it. *In Declarat. Veritatum quæ credendæ sunt* [*necessitate salutis*: (script. an. 1416.) *Op.*, tom. i. col. 22. C. ed. Dupin. Antwerp. 1706.] But in a most ancient manuscript in Corpus Christi College in Cambridge, the words are, Nisi me conmoveret [persuaded], etc.

[9] [Melch.] Canus, *de loc. Theolog.* lib. ii. cap. 8. fol. 34. B. [p. 59.] [*ubi sup.*] sect. xvi. [no. 8. p. 76. note 33.]

[CHAPTER IV.]

XXV. The authority which you pretend against this, is out of Hooker[22]: "Of things necessary, the very chiefest is to know, what books we are bound to esteem holy; which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach." Of this Brierly,[23] the storehouse for all priests that will be idle, and yet seem well read, tells us, that "Hooker gives a very sensible demonstration: 'It is not the word of God, which doth, or possibly can, assure us, that we do well to think it is His word; for if any one book of Scripture did give testimony to all, yet still that Scripture, which giveth credit to the rest, would require another [Scripture] to give credit unto it; neither could we ever come unto any pause, to rest our assurance this way; so that unless, beside Scripture, there were something which might assure, etc.'"[24] And "this he acknowledgeth[25] (saith Brierly) 'is the authority of God's Church.'" Certainly, Hooker gives a true and sensible demonstration; but Brierly wants fidelity and integrity in citing him. For in the first place, Hooker's speech is, "Scripture itself cannot teach this"; nor can the truth say that Scripture itself can. It must needs ordinarily have tradition, to prepare the mind of a man to receive it. And in the next place, where he

For the greatest upholders of tradition that ever were, made the Scripture very necessary in all the ages of the Church: so it was necessary, because it was given; and given, because God thought it necessary. Besides, upon Roman grounds, this I think will follow: That which the tradition of the present Church delivers, as necessary to believe, is *omnino* necessary to salvation: But that there are divine Scriptures, the tradition of the present Church delivers, as necessary to believe: Therefore, to believe there are divine Scriptures, is *omnino* (be the sense of the word what it can) necessary to salvation. So Bellarmine is herein foul and unable to stand upon his own ground. And he is the more, partly, because he avouches this proposition for truth after the New Testament written; and, partly, because he might have seen the state of this proposition carefully examined by Gandavo, and distinguished by times.—[Henr. a Gand.] *Summ.* par. 1. Art. viii. Quæst. 4. in fine. [The whole Quæst. is on this point.—(§ 7. in fin.)]

[22] Book i. ch. xiv. [Sect. i. *Eccl. Polit. Works*, vol. i. p. 267, ed. Church and Paget. His words are: "If only those things be necessary, as surely none else are, without the knowledge and practice whereof it is not the will and pleasure of God to make any ordinary grant of salvation; it may be notwithstanding, and oftentimes hath been, demanded, how the books of Holy Scripture contain in them all necessary things, when of things necessary, the very chiefest," etc.]

[23] *Protestants' Apology* [*for the Roman Church*,] Tractate i. Sect. 10. No. iii. [pp. 254, 255.—By John Brereley, Priest: Permissu Superiorum. An. MDCVIII.—This work was also translated into Latin: Apologia Protestantium pro Romana Ecclesia, etc. per Guilielmum Raynerium, Latine versa.—Lut. Par. 1615.]

[24] Book ii. ch. iv. [Sect. 2. *Eccl. Polit. Works*, vol. i. p. 295, ed. C. and P., *ubi sup.* p. 81. note 45.]

[25] Book ii. ch. vii. [Sect. 3. *Eccl. Polit. Works*, vol. i. p. 321. *vide infra*, note 27.] and Book iii. ch. viii. [Sect. 14. *Eccl. Polit. Works*, vol. i. p. 376. *vide infra*, note 28.]

speaks so sensibly, that Scripture cannot bear witness to itself, nor one part of it to another; that is grounded upon nature, which admits no created thing to be witness to itself; and is acknowledged by our Saviour: "If I bear witness to Myself, My witness is not true,"[26] that is, is not of force to be reasonably accepted for truth. But then it is more than manifest, that Hooker delivers his demonstration of Scripture alone. For if Scripture hath another proof, nay, many other proofs, to usher it and lead it in, then, no question, it can both prove and approve itself. His words are: "So that unless, beside Scripture, there be, etc." "Beside Scripture:" therefore he excludes not Scripture, though he call for another proof to lead it in, and help in assurance, namely, Tradition, which no man, that hath his brains about him, denies. In the two other places, Brierly falsifies shamefully; for holding up all that Hooker says in these words, "This (other means to assure us besides Scripture) is the authority of God's Church," he wrinkles that worthy author desperately, and shrinks up his meaning. For in the former place abused by Brierly, no man can set a better state of the question between Scripture and tradition, than Hooker doth. His words are these: "The Scripture is the ground of our belief; the authority of man (that is the name he gives to tradition) is the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scripture."[27] I ask now, when a man is entered, and hath viewed a house, and upon viewing likes it, and upon liking resolves unchangeably to dwell there; doth he set up his resolution upon the key that let him in? No sure! but upon the goodness and commodiousness which he sees in the house. And this is all the difference, that I know, between us in this point; in which, do you grant, as you ought to do, that we resolve our faith into Scripture as the ground; and we will never deny that tradition is the key that lets us in. In the latter place, Hooker is as plain, as constant to himself and truth. His words are: "The first outward motive, leading men so to esteem of the Scripture, is the authority of God's Church, etc. But afterwards, the more we bestow our labour in reading or learning the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it; so that the former

[26] *St. Joh.* v. 31.—He speaks of Himself as man.

[27] Book ii. chap. vii. [Sect. 3. *Eccl. Polit. Works*, vol. i. p. 321, ed. C. and P. Hooker's words in full are: "For whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by Christ, although the Scripture be therein the ground of our belief; yet the authority of man is, if we mark it, the key, etc."]

[CHAPTER IV.]

inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very thing hath ministered further reason."[28] Here then again, in his judgment, tradition is the first inducement; but the further reason and ground is the Scripture. And resolution of faith ever settles upon the furthest reason it can, not upon the first inducement. So that the state of this question is firm, and yet plain enough, to him that will not shut his eyes.

A. C. p. 52.

XXVI. Now here, after a long silence, A. C. thrusts himself in again, and tells me, "That if I would consider the tradition of the Church, not only as it is the tradition of a company of fallible men, in which sense the authority of it, as himself confesses, is but human and fallible, etc.; but, as the tradition of a company of men, assisted by Christ and His Holy Spirit; in that sense I might easily find it more than an introduction, indeed as much as would amount to an infallible motive." Well, I have considered the tradition of the present Church both these ways; and I find that A. C. confesses, that, in the first sense, the tradition of the Church is mere human authority, and no more: and therefore, in this sense, it may serve for an introduction to this belief, but no more. And in the second sense, "as it is not the tradition of a company of men only, but of men assisted by Christ and His Spirit"; in this second sense, I cannot find that the tradition of the present Church is of divine and infallible authority, till A. C. can prove that this company of men, (the Roman prelates and their clergy he means,) are so fully, so clearly, so permanently assisted by Christ and His Spirit, as may reach to infallibility, much less to a divine infallibility, in this or any other principle which they teach. For every assistance of Christ and the blessed Spirit, is not enough to make the authority of any company of men divine and infallible; but such and so great an assistance only, as is purposely given to that effect. Such an assistance, the Prophets under the Old Testament, and the Apostles under the New, had; but neither the high-priest with his clergy in the Old, nor any company of prelates or priests in the New, since the Apostles, ever had it. And there-

[28] Book iii. ch. viii. [Sect. 14. *Eccl. Polit. Works*, vol. i. p. 376, ed. Church and Paget. Hooker's words are: "And by experience we all know that the first outward motive, leading men so to esteem of the Scripture, is the authority of God's Church. For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it, even at the first, an impudent thing for any man, bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards, the more, etc."]

fore, though at the entreaty of A. C. I have "considered" this very well, yet I cannot, no not in this assisted sense, think the tradition of the present Church divine and infallible, or such company of men to be worthy of divine and infallible credit, and sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith. Which I am sorry A. C. should affirm so boldly as he doth. What! That company of men, the Roman bishop and his clergy, of divine and infallible credit, and sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith! Good God! Whither will these men go? Surely they are "wise in their generation," but that makes them never a whit the more "the children of light." And could they put this home upon the world, as they are gone far in it, what might they not effect? How might they, and would they, then "lord" it over the faith of Christendom, contrary to St. Peter's rule, whose successors certainly in this they are not! But I pray, if this company of men be infallibly assisted, whence is it that this very company have erred so dangerously as they have, not only in some other things, but even in this particular, by equalling the tradition of the present Church to the written word of God? Which is a doctrine unknown to the primitive Church,[29] and

Section XVI.

A. C. p. 52.

A. C. p. 52.

Luke xvi. 8.

1 Pet. v. 3.

[29] St. Basil goes as far for traditions as any. For he says: Parem vim habent ad pietatem. [They have equal strength to produce piety.]—Lib. *de Spiritu Sancto*, cap. xxvii. [*Op.*, tom. iii. p. 54. D. ed. Benedict. Migne, iv. 188. Τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ κηρυγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγράφου διδασκαλίας ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως διαδοθέντα ἡμῖν ἐν μυστηρίῳ παραδεξάμεθα· ἅπερ ἀμφότερα τὴν αὐτὴν ἰσχὺν ἔχει πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν· καὶ τούτοις οὐδεὶς ἀντερεῖ, οὐκοῦν ὅστις γε κατὰ μικρὸν γοῦν θεσμῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πεπείραται. Now, of the dogmas and declarations observed in the Church, some we have from the written teachings, but others we have received from the traditions of the Apostles mysteriously handed down to us; both of these have the same strength to produce piety; and no one will deny this, at least no one who has had a little experience of the Church's oracles.] But first he speaks of Apostolical tradition, [λέξιν ἡμῖν ἐκ πατέρων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθοῦσαν, words coming to us from our fathers down to our own time,] not of the tradition of the present Church. Secondly, the learned take exceptions to this book of St. Basil, as corrupted. [ex. grat. "This (of Traditions) is matter of opinion, not of practice; and so toucheth not the face of the Church. Exceptions have been made by Erasmus, and other learned men, to this book (*de Spiritu Sancto*). We oppose to it out of Basil's treatise *de Fide*, which never was questioned till now, or lately by the Cardinal (Perron), these words: Haud dubio manifestissimum hoc infidelitatis argumentum fuerit, et signum superbiæ certissimum, si quis eorum quæ scripta sunt aliquid velit rejicere, aut eorum quæ non scripta introducere." Certainly this would be the plainest proof of want of faith, and a most certain sign of pride, if any one should wish to reject any part of Scripture, or to add to it anything which is not Scripture. (Φανέρα ἔκπτωσις. It is a plain falling away. κ.τ.λ. *ubi sup.* p. 62. note 1.)] Bp. Andrewes' *Opuscul. cont. Perron.* [*i.e.* Stricturæ: or a briefe answer to

[CHAPTER IV.] which frets upon the very foundation itself, by jostling with it. So belike, he that hath but half an indifferent eye, may see this assisted company have erred; and yet we must wink in obedience, and think them infallible.

A. C. p. 52. XXVII. But, A. C. would have me consider again, That it is as easy to take the tradition of the present Church in the two forenamed senses, as the present Scriptures printed and approved by men of this age. For in the first sense, the very Scriptures, saith he, considered as printed and approved by men of this age, can be no more than of human credit. But in the second sense, as printed and approved by men assisted by God's Spirit, for true copies of that which was first written, then we may give infallible credit to them. Well, I have considered this too; and I can take the printing and approving the copies of Holy Writ in these two senses; and I can and do make a difference between copies printed and approved by mere moral men, and men assisted by God's Spirit: and yet for the printing only, a skilful and an able moral man may do better service to the Church than an illiterate man, though assisted in other things by God's Spirit. But when I have considered all this, what then? The Scripture being put in writing, is a thing visibly existent; and if any error be in the print, it is easily corrigible by former copies.[30] Tradition is not so

the xviii. chapter of the first book of Cardinall Perron's reply, written in French to King James's answer, etc. London. 1629.] p. 9. Thirdly, St. Basil himself, Serm. *de fide*, [*Op.*, tom. ii. p. 224. B. *ubi sup.* p. 69. note 18. Migne, iii. 677.] professes that he uses sometimes Agrapha, sed ea solum quæ non sunt aliena a pia secundum Scripturam sententia.— ἄλλοτε ἄλλαις, ὡς ἂν ἡ χρεία τῶν νοσούντων κατηνάγκασε, καὶ ταύταις πολλάκις ἀγράφοις μὲν, ὅμως δ' οὖν οὐκ ἀπεξενωμέναις τῆς κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν εὐσεβοῦς διανοίας. Sometimes to one part, sometimes to another, as the requirements of the sick took me, and certainly often to those unwritten passages, but only to those among them which did not differ from the pious intelligence to be found in Scripture.] So he makes the Scripture their touchstone or trial, and therefore must of necessity make Scripture superior, inasmuch as that, which is able to try another, is of greater force and superior dignity in that use, than the thing tried by it. And Stapleton himself confesses: Traditio recentior et posterior, vel particularis, nullo modo cum Scriptura, vel cum traditionibus prius explicatis, comparanda est. [A tradition new or more recent or private must be in no wise compared with Scripture, nor with traditions published earlier.]— Stapleton, *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] v. [de Potest. Eccl. circa doctrin. non script.] Quæst. v. Art. 2. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 794. C.]

[30] [*Vide infra*,] Sect. xviii. No. 4. [for a passage from] S. Augustin. *contra Faustum*, lib. xxxii. cap. 16. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 459. C. Nullo modo vos potuisse falsare codices, qui jam in manibus essent omnium Christianorum? Quia mox, ut facere cœpissetis, vetustiorum exemplarium veritate convinceremini. In no way could you have falsified the copies which are already in the hands of every Christian. For directly you began to do it, you would be convicted by the correctness of earlier examples.]

easily observed, nor so safely kept. And howsoever, to come home to that which A. C. infers upon it, namely, That the tradition of the present Church may be accepted in these two senses: and if this be all that he will infer, (for his pen here is troubled and forsakes him, whether by any check of conscience or no, I know not,) I will [grant,] and, you see, have granted it already without more ado, with this caution, That every company of men, assisted by God's Spirit, are not assisted to this height, to be infallible by divine authority.

SECTION XVI.

A. C. p. 53.

XXVIII. For all this, A. C. will needs give a needless proof of the business, namely, That there is the promise of Christ's and His Holy Spirit's continual presence and assistance, not only to the Apostles, but to their successors also, the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the Church in all ages; and that this promise is no less, but rather more expressly to them in their preaching by word of mouth, than in writing, or reading, or printing, or approving of copies of what was formerly written by the Apostles. And to all this I shall briefly say, That there is a promise of Christ's and the Holy Spirit's continual presence and assistance. I do likewise grant most freely, that this promise is, on the part of Christ and the Holy Ghost, most really and fully performed. But then this promise must not be extended further than it was made. It was made of continual presence and assistance,—that I grant; and it was made to the Apostles and their successors,—that I grant too: but in a different degree. For it was of continual and infallible assistance to the Apostles; but to their successors, of continual and fitting assistance, but not infallible. And therefore, the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the Church in all ages have had, and shall have, continual assistance; but by A. C.'s leave, not infallible, at least, not divine and infallible, either in writing, reading, printing, or approving copies. And I believe A. C. is the first that durst affirm this. I thought he would have kept the Pope's prerogative entire, that he only might have been infallible; and not he neither, but *in cathedra*, sat down and well advised. And "well advised!" Yes, that is right. But he may be sat,[31] and not well advised, even *in*

A. C. p. 53.

Luke x. 16. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. John xiv. 16.

[31] Nam multæ sunt Decretales hæreticæ, sicut dicet Ocham. Et firmiter hoc credo; sed non licet dogmatizare oppositum, quoniam sunt determinatæ, nisi manifeste constet. [For there are many heretical Decretals, as Ockham says. And I fully believe it; but it is not permissible to hold the opposite dogma, since judgment has been given on these, unless there can be no question.]—Jac. Almain. in III. *Sent.* Distinct. xxiv.

[CHAPTER IV.]

cathedra. And now, shall we have all the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of that Church in all ages, infallible too? Here is a deal of infallibility indeed, and yet error store. The truth is, the Jesuits have a month's mind to this infallibility. And though A. C., out of his bounty, is content to extend it to all the lawfully sent pastors of the Church, yet to his own society questionless he means it chiefly: as did the apologist, to whom Casaubon replies [in a letter] to Fronto Ducæus. The words of the apologist [82] are: "Let day and night, . . . life and death be joined together, and then there will be some hope, that heresy may fall upon the person of a Jesuit." Yea, marry, this is something indeed: now we know where infallibility is to be found. But for my present occasion, touching the lawfully sent pastors of the Church, etc., I will give no other confutation of it, than that Mr. Fisher and A. C., if they be two men, are lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the Church; at least I am sure, they will assume they are: and yet they are not infallible; which, I think, appears plain enough in some of their errors manifested by this discourse and elsewhere. Or, if they do hold themselves infallible, let them speak it out, as the apologist did.

A. C. p. 53.

XXIX. As for the three places of Scripture, which A. C. cites, they are of old alleged and well known in this controversy. The first is in St. Luke x. where Christ saith, "He that heareth you

Luke x. 16.

Quæst. unic. Conclus. 6. Dub. 6. in fine. [fol. lxxix.] And Alphonsus a Castro both says and proves, Cælestinum papam errasse, non ut privatam personam, sed ut papam. [The Pope Celestine erred, not as a private person, but as pope.]—Lib. i. *adv. Hæres.* cap. iv. [col. 20, 21.]—And the Gloss confesses, Eum errare posse, [that he can err,] in [Decret. ii. par. xi.] Caus. xxiv. Quæst. i. cap. (ix.) A recta ergo.

[82] Nam in fide quidem Jesuitam errare non posse, atque adeo esse hoc unicum τῶν ἀδυνάτων, cæteris, quæ solent a poetis plurima commemorari, posthac annumerandum, si nescis, mi Fronto, et puto nescire, docebo et ab apologista doctus, hoc ipsum disertis verbis affirmante. Sic ille cap. iii. ejus exemplaris quod ad serenissimum Regem fuit missum, pagina 119. Jungantur in unum, ait, dies cum nocte, tenebræ cum luce, calidum cum frigido, sanitas cum morbo, vita cum morte; et erit tum spes aliqua posse in caput Jesuitæ hæresin cadere. [For that no Jesuit can err in a matter of faith, and that therefore this special impossibility must be added to the large number of others, which are recorded by poets, this I will teach you, dear Fronto, if you are ignorant, and I think you are; for I learnt it from an Apologist, who affirmed it precisely and with eloquent words. This is what he says in the third chapter of that Book which was sent to the most august king, page 119. Let day be mixed with night, he says, darkness with light, heat with cold, health with disease, life with death; and then there will be some possibility that a heresy should get into a Jesuit's head.]—Isa. Casaubon. *Epist. ad Front. Ducæum*, [dat.] Lond. [vii. Non. Jul.] 1611. [Isaaci Casaubon. *Epist.* dccxx. p. 397. ed. Almeloveen. Roterod. 1709.—The "Apologist" alluded to was Bellarmine himself. See Thuan. *Continuat. Histor.* pp. 51, 52.]

SECTION XVI.

heareth Me." This was absolutely true in the Apostles,[33] who kept themselves to that which was revealed by Christ; but it was to be but conditionally true in their successors,[34] "He that heareth you, heareth Me"; that is, so long and so far[35] as you speak My words, and not your own.[36] For where the command is for preaching, the restraint is added. "Go," saith Christ, "and teach all nations." But you may not preach all things what you please, but "all things which I have commanded you." The publication is yours, the doctrine is Mine: and where the doctrine is not Mine, there your publication is beyond, or short of, your commission. The second place is in St. Matthew xxviii. There Christ says again, "I am with you always unto the end of the world." Yes, most certain it is, present by His spirit: for else in bodily presence He continued not with His Apostles, but during His abode on earth. And this promise of His spiritual presence was to their successors: else, why "to the end of the

Matt. xxviii. 20.

Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

[33] Per quod docet quicquid per sanctos Apostolos dicitur, acceptandum esse, quia qui illos audit, Christum audit, etc. [By this he teaches that whatever is taught by the holy Apostles must be accepted, because he who hears them hears Christ.]—S. Cyrillus [Alexandr.], apud Thom. [Aquin. *in*] *Caten.* [*Aurea.* No commentary on St. Luke is extant among St. Cyril's published works; but in the tenth vol. of the Classici Auctores, published by Cardinal Angelo Mai, is printed nearly the whole of the commentary inserted in the Catena Aurea. Fragments of the same commentary are also published in the ninth vol. of the Scriptores Veteres, by the same editor; but it does not appear that the present passage in the original has been recovered.]—Et Dominus [omnium] dedit Apostolis suis potestatem Evangelii, per quos et veritatem, hoc est, Dei filium cognovimus; quibus et dixit Dominus, Qui vos audit, etc. [And the Lord of all gave to His Apostles the power of the Gospel, and by them we also have known the truth, that is, the Son of God; to them also the Lord said "He who hears you," etc.]—S. Irenæus, præfat. in lib. iii. *advers. Hær.* fine. [*Op.*, p. 198. ed. Grabe. Migne, vii. 843.]

[34] Dicit ad Apostolos, ac per hoc ad omnes præpositos, qui Apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt, Qui audit vos, etc. [He says to the Apostles, and thus to all Bishops who succeed the Apostles by being ordained into their places, "He who hears you," etc.]—S. Cyprian. lib. iv. Epist. 9. [Epist. lxix. *ad Florentium Pupianum*, *Op.*, p. 122. ed. Benedict.] But St. Cyprian doth not say, that this speech of our Saviour's was æqualiter dictum, alike and equally spoken and promised to the Apostles and the succeeding bishops. And I believe A. C. will not dare to say in plain and express terms that this speech, "He that heareth you, heareth Me," doth as amply belong to every Roman priest as to St. Peter and the Apostles. No, a great deal of difference will become them well.

[35] "Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ."—*1 Cor.* ii. 1. and *1 Thess.* i. 6.

[36] And so venerable Beda expressly, both for hearing the word, and for contemning it. "For neither of these," saith he, "belong only to them which saw our Saviour in the flesh, but to all *hodie quoque* [to day also]: but with this limitation, if they hear or despise *Evangelii verba*, [the words of the Gospel] not the preacher's own."—Beda in *S. Luc.* x. 15. 16. [apud *Caten. Auream.*]

[Chapter IV.]

world"? The Apostles did not, could not, live so long. But then to the successors the promise goes no further than "I am with you always"; which reaches to continual assistance, but not to divine and infallible.[87] Or, if he think me mistaken, let him shew me any one father of the Church that extends the sense of this place to divine and infallible assistance, granted hereby to all the Apostles' successors. Sure I am St. Gregory[88] thought otherwise. For he says plainly, "That in those gifts of God which concern other men's salvation, of which preaching of the Gospel is one, the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Ghost, doth not always abide in the preachers," be they never so lawfully sent pastors or doctors of the Church. And if the Holy Ghost doth not always abide in the preachers, then most certainly He doth not abide in them to a divine infallibility always. The third place is in St. John xiv. where Christ says, "The Comforter, the Holy Ghost, shall abide with you for ever." Most true again. For the Holy Ghost did abide with the Apostles according to Christ's promise there made, and shall abide with their successors for ever, to comfort and preserve them.[89] But here is no promise

John xiv. 16.

[87] Rabanus Maur[us] goes no further than "that to the end some will always be in the world fit for Christ by His spirit and grace to inhabit." Divina mansione et inhabitatione [sunt] digni. [They are worthy of the Divine mansions and habitations.]—Raban. [Maur.] in *S. Matth.* xxviii. 19, 20. [apud *Caten. Auream. Comment. in Matth.* lib. vii. *Op.*, tom. v. p. 159. G. ed. Colon. 1626.]—Pergatis, habentes Dominum protectorem et ducem, [qui dixit, Ecce ego vobiscum, etc. That ye go, having your Lord as your Protector and Guide, who said, "Lo, I am with you always," etc.,] saith St. Cyprian, lib. iv. Epist. 1. [Epist. lxxxi. *ad Rogatianum et cæteros confessores*, *Op.*, p. 163. ed. Benedict.] But he doth not say, How far forth.—And, Loquitur fidelibus sicut uni corpori, [saith] S. Chrysostom, *Homil. in S. Matth.* [His words are: *οὐ μετ' ἐκείνων δὲ μόνον εἶπεν ἔσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ πάντων τῶν μετ' ἐκείνους πιστευσάντων· οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος οἱ ἀπόστολοι μένειν ἔμελλον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑνὶ σώματι διαλέγεται τοῖς πιστοῖς.* He said that He would not only be with them, but also with all those after them who believed; for the Apostles were not to remain till the end of the world; but He speaks to all the faithful as to one body.—S. Chrysost. *in Matth. Hom.* xc. (al. xci.) cap. 2. *Op.*, tom. vii. p. 841. D. ed. Benedict.] And if St. Chrysostom enlarge it so far, I hope A. C. will not extend the assistance, given or promised here to the whole body of the faithful, to an infallible and divine assistance in every of them, as well as in the pastors and doctors.

[88] In donis, quibus salus aliorum quæritur, qualia sunt prophetiæ et interpretationes sermonum, etc., Spiritus Sanctus nequaquam semper in prædicatoribus permanet. [In those gifts through which the salvation of others is obtained, such as prophecies and interpretations of tongues, etc. the Holy Spirit by no means always abides in the preachers.]—S. Greg. [Magn.] *Moral.* lib. ii. cap. 29. (vet. xlii.) in princ. ed. Basil. 1551. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 73. ed. Benedict.]

[89] Iste consolator non auferetur a vobis, sicut subtrahitur humanitas mea per mortem, sed æternaliter erit vobiscum; hic per gratiam, [sed] in futuro per gloriam. [That Comforter shall not be taken away from you as My Human Presence departs by death, but will be with you for ever: here

of divine infallibility made unto them. And for that promise which is made, and expressly of infallibility, St. John xvi., though not cited by A. C., that is confined to the Apostles only, for the settling of them "in all truth." And yet not simply all: for there are some truths, saith St. Augustine,[40] which no man's soul can comprehend in this life. Not simply all; but all those truths, *quæ non poterant portare*, "which they were not able to bear," when He conversed with them.[41] Not simply all: but all that was necessary for the founding, propagating, establishing, and confirming the Christian Church. But if any man take the boldness to enlarge this promise, in the fulness of it, beyond the persons of the Apostles themselves, that will fall out which St. Augustine hath in a manner prophesied: "every heretic will shelter himself and his vanities under this colour of infallible verity."[42]

SECTION XVI.

John xvi. 13.

XXX. I told you a little before,[43] that A. C.'s pen was troubled, and failed him: therefore I will help to make out his inference for him, that his cause may have all the strength it can. And, as I conceive, this is that he would have:—The tradition of the present Church is as able to work in us divine and infallible faith, that the Scripture is the word of God, as that the Bible, or books of Scripture, now printed and in use, is a true copy of that which was first written by the penmen of the Holy Ghost, and delivered to the Church. It is most true, the tradition of the present Church is alike operative and powerful in and over both these works; but neither divine nor infallible in either. But as it is the first moral inducement to persuade that Scripture is the word

A. C. p. 52.

by Grace, in the Future by Glory.] —Lyra, in *S. Joh.* xiv. 16. [apud Bibl. Sacr. cum Gloss. ordinar. etc.] You see there the Holy Ghost will be present by consolation and grace, not by infallible assistance.

[40] Omnem veritatem, non arbitror in hac vita in cujusquam mente [posse] compleri: [I do not think that anybody's mind can be filled with all truth in this life.]—S. Augustin. *in S. Johan.* [cap. xvi. 13.] Tract. xcvi. (4.) versus fin. [*Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 735. F. Migne, iii. 1876.]

[41] Spiritus sanctus, qui eos doceret omnem veritatem, quam tunc, [quando] cum eis loquebatur, portare non poterant. [The Holy Ghost, Who would teach them all truth which at that time that He was speaking to them they were not able to bear.]—S. Augustin. *in S. Johan.* [cap.] xvi. 12, 13. Tract. xcvii. (1.) in princ. [*Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 736. D. Migne, iii. 1877.]

[42] Omnes autem insipientissimi Hæretici, qui se Christianos vocari volunt, audacias figmentorum suorum, quas maxime exhorret sensus humanus, hac occasione Evangelicæ sententiæ colorare conantur, [ubi Dominus ait, Adhuc multa, etc. But all the most stupid heretics, who wish to be called Christians, try to shelter their audacious lies which are most abhorrent to the commonsense of mankind, under that sentence of the Gospel where the Lord says "I have still many things," etc.]—S. Augustin. *in S. Johan.* cap. xvi. 12, 13, Tract. xcvii. (3.) circa med. [*ibid.* col. 738. B. Migne, iii. 1879.]

[43] [*Ubi sup.* Sect. xvi.] No. 27.

[CHAPTER IV.] of God, so is it also the first, but moral still, that the Bible we now have, is a true copy of that which was first written. But then, as in the former, so in this latter, for the true copy, the last resolution of our faith cannot possibly rest upon the naked tradition of the present Church, but must, by and with it, go higher to other helps and assurances: where, I hope, A. C. will confess we have greater helps to discover the truth or falsehood of a copy, than we have means to look into a tradition; or especially to sift out this truth, That it was a divine and infallible revelation by which the originals of Scripture were first written: that being far more the subject of this inquiry than the copy, which, according to art and science, may be examined by former preceding copies, close up to the very Apostles' times.

A. C. p. 53. XXXI. But A. C. hath not done yet: for in the last place he tells us, that tradition and Scripture, without any vicious circle, do mutually confirm the authority either of other. And truly, for my part, I shall easily grant him this, so he will grant me this other: namely, that though they do mutually, yet they do not equally, confirm the authority either of other. For Scripture doth infallibly confirm the authority of Church traditions, truly so called; but tradition doth but morally and probably confirm the authority of the Scripture. And this is manifest by A. C.'s own similitude: "For," saith he, "it is as a king's ambassador's word of mouth, and his king's letters bear mutual witness to each other." Just so indeed: for his king's letters of credence, under hand and seal, confirm the ambassador's authority infallibly to all that know seal and hand: but the ambassador's word of mouth confirms his king's letters but only probably; for else, why are they called letters of credence, if they give not him more credit than he can give them? But that which follows I cannot approve: to wit, "That the lawfully sent preachers of the Gospel are God's legates, and the Scriptures God's letters, which He hath appointed His legates to deliver and expound." So far it is well, but here's the sting: "that these letters do warrant, that the people may hear and give credit to these legates of Christ, as to Christ the king Himself." Soft: this is too high a great deal. No legate was ever of so great credit as the king himself.[44] Nor was any priest, never so lawfully sent, ever of that authority

John xiii. 13. that Christ Himself. No, sure: for "ye call Me Master and

[44] Will A. C. maintain that any Legate *a latere* is of as great credit as the Pope himself?

Lord; and ye do well, for so I am," saith our Saviour. And certainly, this did not suddenly drop out of A. C.'s pen: for he told us once before, "That this company of men which deliver the present Church's tradition, that is, the lawfully-sent preachers of the Church are assisted by God's Spirit to have in them divine and infallible authority, and to be worthy of divine and infallible credit, sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith." Why, but is it possible these men should go thus far to defend an error, be it never so dear unto them? They as Christ! Divine and infallible authority in them! "Sufficient to breed in us divine and infallible faith!" I have often heard some wise men say, that the Jesuit in the Church of Rome, and the precise party in the reformed Churches, agree in many things, though they would seem most to differ. And surely this is one: for both of them differ extremely about tradition: the one in magnifying it, and exalting it into divine authority; the other vilifying and depressing it almost beneath human. And yet, even in these different ways, both agree in this consequent,—That the sermons and preachings by word of mouth of the lawfully-sent pastors and doctors of the Church, are able to breed in us divine and infallible faith; nay, are the very word of God.[45] So A. C. expressly: and no less than so, have some accounted of their own factious words, to say no more, than as the word of God.[46] I ever took sermons, and so do still, to be most necessary expositions and applications of Holy Scripture, and a great ordinary means of saving knowledge; but I cannot think them, or the preachers of them, divinely infallible. The ancient fathers of the Church preached far beyond any of these of either faction; and yet no one of them durst think himself infallible, much less, that whatsoever he preached was the word of God. And it may be

Section XVI.

A. C. p. 52.

[45] For this A. C. says expressly of tradition, p. 52. And then he adds, "that the promise for this was no less, but rather more expressly made to the lawfully-sent pastors and doctors of the Church in all ages, in their teaching by word of mouth, than in writing," etc. p. 53.

[46] For the freeing of factious and silenced ministers, is termed "the restoring of God's word to its liberty"; in the godly author [W. Prynne] of the late *Newes from Ipswich*, p. 5. ["Certainly till his Majesty shall see these purgations (viz. of certain passages alleged to have been erased by Archbishop Laud from the Fast-book,) rectified, superstition and idolatry removed, God's sabbaths duly observed, the suppressed preachers and preaching of God's word restored, etc. . . . What then can we expect but plagues upon plagues, till such desperate persecutors be cut off, and God's word and ministers restored to their former liberty, by our most gracious Sovereign?"—*Newes from Ipswich*, etc. . . . First printed at Ipswich, and now reprinted for T. Bates. 1641.]

[CHAPTER IV.] observed too, that no men are more apt to say, That all the fathers were but men, and might err, than they that think their own preachings are infallible.

XXXII. The next thing, after this large interpretation of A. C., which I shall trouble you with, is, That this method and manner of proving Scripture to be the word of God, which I here use, is the same which the ancient Church ever held, namely, tradition, or ecclesiastical authority, first; and then all other arguments, but especially internal, from the Scripture itself. This way the Church went in St. Augustine's time.[47] He was no enemy to Church-tradition; yet when he would prove that the Author of the Scripture, and so of the whole knowledge of divinity, as it is supernatural, is *Deus in Christo*, "God in Christ," he takes this as the all-sufficient way, and gives four proofs, all internal to the Scripture: first, the miracles; secondly, that there is nothing carnal in the doctrine; thirdly, that there hath been such performance of it; fourthly, that by such a doctrine of humility, the whole world almost hath been converted. And whereas, *ad muniendam fidem*, for the defending of the faith, and keeping it entire, there are two things requisite—Scripture and Church-tradition,—Vincent[ius] Lirinens[is][48] places authority of Scriptures first, and then tradition. And since it is apparent that tradition is first in order of time, it must necessarily follow that Scripture is first in order of nature; that is, the chief upon which faith
John iv. rests and resolves itself. And your own school confesses this was

[47] And St. Augustine himself, *contra Faustum*, lib. xiii. cap. 5. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 254. E.] proves by an internal argument the fulfilling of the prophets. Scriptura quæ fidem suam rebus ipsis probat, quæ per temporum successiones hæc impleri [et effici ostendit, quæ tamen, ante quam fierent, pronuntiavit. Scripture, which proves its truth by actual events, and which shows that in the course of time the very things are fulfilled and carried out which it had actually announced before they happened.]—And Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* par. 1. A[rtic.] ix. Q[uæst.] 3: [the four arguments are stated in Art. ix. Quæst. 3. §§ 8, 9, 10, 11. p. 179. with long quotations from S. Aug. *de vera Relig.*] cites St. Augustine's book *de vera Religione.* In which book, though these four arguments are not found in terms together, yet they fill up the scope of the whole book.

[48] [Quod sive ego, sive quis alius vellet exurgentium hæreticorum fraudes deprehendere, laqueosque vitare, et in fide sana sanus atque integer permanere.] duplici modo munire fidem [suam, Domino adjuvante, deberet.] Primo [scilicet] Divinæ legis auctoritate; tum deinde Ecclesiæ Catholicæ traditione. [Either I or any other who should wish to detect the deceits of rising heretics, and to avoid their traps, and to remain true and sound in the true faith, ought in a double manner to defend our faith with the help of God: first by the authority of the Divine Law, and secondly by the tradition of the Catholic Church.]—[Vin. Lirinens.] *contra Hær.* cap. 1. [p. 4.]

the way ever. The woman of Samaria is a known resemblance, but allowed by yourselves: for "*quotidie*,[49] daily with them that are without, Christ enters by the woman, that is, the Church, and they believe by that fame which she gives, etc.: but when they come to hear Christ Himself, they believe His words before the words of the woman: for when they have once found Christ,[50] they do more believe His words in Scripture, than they do the Church which testifies of Him; because then, *propter illam*, for the Scripture, they believe the Church; and, if the Church should speak contrary to the Scripture, they would not believe it." Thus the school taught then; and thus the gloss commented then; and when men have tired themselves, hither they must come. The key that lets men into the Scriptures, even to this knowledge of them, that they are the word of God, is the tradition of the Church: but when they are in, they hear Christ Himself immediately speaking in Scripture to the faithful;[51] and "His sheep" do not only "hear," but know, "His voice." And then here is no vicious circle indeed of proving the Scripture by the Church, and then round about, the Church by the Scripture. Only distinguish the times and the conditions of men, and all is safe. For a beginner in the faith, or a weakling, or a doubter about it, begins at tradition, and proves Scripture by the Church; but a man strong and grown up in the faith, and understandingly conversant in the word of God,

John x. 4.

[49] Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* par. 1. Artic. x. Q[uæst.] 1. [§ 10.] Sic quotidie apud illos, qui foris sunt, nunciatur Christus per mulierem id est Ecclesiam, et credunt per istam famam, etc. [So every day, Christ is announced to those who are without through the woman, that is the Church, and they believe because of her saying.]—Gloss. [ordinar.] in S. Joh. cap. iv. [ut sup. apud Henr. a Gand.]

[50] Plus verbis Christi, *i.e.* Scripturæ quam ecclesiæ testificanti quia proptur illam jam credit Ecclesiæ, et si ipsa quidem contraria Scripturæ diceret, ipsi non crederet, etc. [Henr. a Gand.] primam fidem tribuamus Scripturis canonicis; secundam, sub ista, definitionibus et consuetudinibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ. Post istas [habent Christiani credere], non [quidem] sub pœna perfidiæ, sed proterviæ, [vel crassæ contumaciæ,] studiosis viris [et amatoribus veritatis. He believes rather the words of Christ in the Scripture than the Church giving her witness, since because of the Scripture he now believes the Church, and if the Church were to say anything contrary to the Scripture, he would not believe her. Let us attribute our faith first to the canonical Scriptures, secondly, under it, to the definitions and customs of the Catholic Church. After these, Christians have to believe men who are learned and lovers of the truth under pain of the charge not of want of faith, but of conceit and dense obstinacy.—[Thom.] Waldensis, *Doctrinal. Fidei*, tom. i. lib. 2. art. ii. cap. 23. no. 9. [fol. 107. col. 3. ed. Paris. 1532.]

[51] In Sacra Scriptura Ipse immediate loquitur fidelibus. [In Holy Scriptures Christ Himself speaks directly to the faithful.]—*Ibid.* [Henr. a Gand. *ubi sup.* note 49.]

[CHAPTER IV.]

proves the Church by the Scripture. And then upon the matter, we have a double divine testimony, altogether infallible, to confirm unto us, that Scripture is the word of God. The first is the tradition of the Church of the Apostles themselves, who delivered immediately to the world the word of Christ: the other, the Scripture itself; but after it hath received this testimony. And into these we do, and may safely, resolve our faith. As for the tradition of after ages, in and about which miracles and divine power were not so evident, we believe them, by Gandavo's full confession,[52] because they do not preach other things than those former (the Apostles) left in *scriptis certissimis*, "in most certain Scripture." And it appears by men in the middle ages, that these writings were vitiated in nothing, by the concordant consent in them of all succeeders, to our own time.

XXXIII. And now by this time, it will be no hard thing to reconcile the fathers, which seem to speak differently in no few places, both one from another, and the same from themselves, touching Scripture and tradition; and that as well in this point, to prove Scripture to be the word of God, as for concordant exposition of Scripture in all things else. When therefore the fathers say, We have the Scriptures by tradition,[53] or the like, either they mean the tradition of the Apostles themselves delivering it; and there, when it is known to be such, we may resolve our faith: or, if they speak of the present Church, then they

[52] Quod autem credimus posterioribus, circa quos non apparent virtutes divinæ, hoc est, quia non prædicant alia quam quæ illi in scriptis certissimis reliquerunt: quæ constat per medios in nullo fuisse vitiata ex consensione concordi in eis omnium succedentium usque ad tempora nostra. [The reason why we believe the later teachers, in whose lives the Divine virtues do not shew themselves, is this, that they preach the same things which the Apostles left in their authentic writings: which have certainly not been corrupted in anything by intermediate generations, for each succeeding generation up to our own time bears consenting testimony.]—Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* par. 1. A[rtic.] ix. Q[uæst.] 3. [§ 13. p. 180.]

[53] Scripturas habemus ex traditione. [We have the Scriptures by tradition.]—S. Cyril. Hierosolym. *Catech.* iv. [πολὺ σοῦ φρονιμώτεροι καὶ εὐλαβέστεροι ἦσαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπίσκοποι, οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προστάται, οἱ ταύτας παραδόντες. The Apostles were much wiser and more pious than you and so were the ancient Bishops who presided over the Church, and handed down these Scriptures to us.]—*Cateches.* iv. cap. 34. (al. 22.) [*Op.*, p. 68. E. ed. Benedict. Migne, 497.] Multa quæ non inveniuntur in literis [eorum], (sc. Apostolorum), [neque in conciliis posterioribus, et tamen, quia per universam custodiuntur ecclesiam,] non nisi ab ipsis tradita et commendata creduntur. [Many things which are not found in the letters of the Apostles nor in the later Councils, still, because they are observed by the Universal Church, are believed just as if they were handed down by them and had their sanction.]—S. Augustin. *de Baptismo contra Donatist.* lib. ii. cap. 7. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 102. E. Migne, ix. 133.]

mean that the tradition of it is that by which we first receive the Scripture, as by an according means to the prime tradition. But because it is not "simply divine," we cannot resolve our faith into it, nor settle our faith upon it, till it resolve itself into the prime tradition of the Apostles, or the Scripture, or both; and there we rest with it. And you cannot shew an ordinary consent of fathers: nay, can you, or any of your quarter, shew any one father of the Church, Greek or Latin, that ever said, We are to resolve our faith, that Scripture is the word of God, into the tradition of the present Church? And again, when the fathers say, We are to rely upon Scripture only,[54] they are never to be understood with exclusion of tradition, in what causes soever it may be had. Not but that the Scripture is abundantly sufficient, in and to itself, for all things,[55] but because it is deep, and may be drawn into different senses, and so be mistaken, if any man will presume upon his own strength, and go single without the Church.

[THE ROMAN CHURCH IN 1622.

The present seems a suitable point to consider how the Roman Church presented itself in the year 1622 to the stronger and more educated intellects in the English Communion.

On the 28th of January, 1621, the great Borghese Pope, Paul V., had died of apoplexy. He had reigned for sixteen years, a long time for a Pope in those days; and his force of character and the skill of his ministers had raised the Papacy high in Europe. Many countries had been reconquered to the Papal submission; and the desolating war of thirty years which he had lighted in Germany was promising, when he died, to bring that whole country, the first to throw off the Roman yoke, back to the Papal See.

Paul V., Borghese, was an unscrupulous and cruel potentate, and his first act as Pope had been to seize a poor Roman writer who had foolishly compared Pope Clement VIII. to Tiberius and to have him

[54] Neque enim scientiam cœlestium per semet [humana imbecillitas consequetur, etc. Human nature is too stupid to master unaided the knowledge of heavenly things.]—S. Hilar. *de Trinit.* lib. iv. [cap. 14. *Op.*, col. 835. C. ed. Benedict. Migne, ii. 107.] —Si angelus de cœlo annunciaverit (*Gal.* i. 8) præterquam quod in Scripturis [legalibus et evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit. If an angel from Heaven should preach anything beyond what you have received in the lawful and evangelical Scriptures let him be anathema.]—S. Augustin. *contra* [*literas*] *Petiliani*, lib. iii. cap. 6. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 301. E. Migne, ix. 351.]

[55] Quum sit perfectus Scripturarum canon, sibique ad omnia satis superque sufficiat. [Since the Canon of the Scriptures is complete, and is in itself sufficient for all things, and more than sufficient.]—Vin. Lirinens. *contra Hær.* cap. ii. [pp. 4, 5.] And if it be *sibi ad omnia*, then to this, to prove itself, at least after tradition hath prepared us to receive it.

[CHAPTER IV.] publicly beheaded on the Bridge of S. Angelo. Cruel and unscrupulous as he was, lovers of the Roman city will always mention Paul's name with respect as the founder of the wealthy, magnificent, artistic House of the Borghese.

His place was taken by Gregory XV., famous also as the founder of a famous house, the Ludovisi; he was feeble, sick, and bent with age, nearly seventy and very infirm for his years, and was chosen apparently as not likely long to stand in the path of ambitious Cardinals. But for the moment his power was unexpectedly seized and wielded by his nephew, Ludovico Ludovisi, a young man of twenty-five, full of talent and of audacity. Cardinal Ludovisi was the patron of the Jesuits. He it was who built that gorgeous Church of St. Ignatius, still so famous among the Roman churches for its splendour and magnificence. He it was who caused the first two great Jesuits to be canonised, St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis Xavier. He it was who established the College of the Propaganda, whose duty is to spread Romanism over the world.

Severe, orthodox, oppressive was this young Cardinal; he had great plans—plans which we cannot help admiring. And the result has proved how well he had gauged the tendencies of the future. To-day Roman worship and the spiritual life of Rome are not to be seen or to be studied in the great Vatican Church built over St. Peter's grave; nor in the old historic home of the Papacy, St. John Lateran; nor in the vast Basilica of St. Paul. Travellers get a very false opinion in those splendid churches of the spiritual fervour of the Romans, and think religion near its death in the Papal city. But in the Jesuit Church (the Gesu) the power of religion still lives; there men gather to pray round the body of the canonised Ignatius, whose dead hand still holds the Papacy and the Roman Church in its grip. Certainly Ludovisi was a great thinker and a mighty man of action. His uncle's legates, or rather his legates, were driving Protestant preachers out of every district of Germany. The persecution was at its height in 1622. Gregory reigned only for two years, but in those two years he made his nephew wealthy and powerful; and his nephew pushed forward Romanism in all quarters. Opposition to such a ruler was dangerous enough.

And yet what a picture! We can see Laud glancing at Buckingham as the question of the present infallible Pope comes up, with a look which says, "Note, you must receive Abraham, Joseph, and Moses, St. Paul and St. John, even our Saviour Jesus Christ Himself, on the bare word of this aged invalid in the Vatican, swayed by the decisions of a young man of twenty-five. Is this what you are prepared to accept?"

But the personal factor is never introduced by Laud into his argument. He proceeds now to sum up the proof, which he thinks sufficient, for the inspiration of the Bible.]

[CHAPTER V.

Proofs that Scripture is the Word of God.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

SECTION XVI.

First, every Science must have its presupposed principles. Secondly, in the Science of Divinity, these principles resolve into "the maxims of divine knowledge supernatural." Thirdly, they are known by faith, which is a mixed act of the Will and the Understanding. Fourthly, the great mysteries of Divinity rest, not on the testimony of the Church, but on the infallibility of God. Fifthly, the historical evidence that the Books of Scripture were written by the Prophets, Apostles, etc., is amply sufficient; and the evidence that the writers were inspired by God is not their own assertion, nor is it miracles, nor is it reason, but faith. Sixthly, our assent to the principle that Scripture is the Word of God and therefore the supreme authority does not depend on reasoning but on faith; and therefore men who are convinced of the power of their own wisdom cannot accept it. Seventhly, the knowledge of the supreme Cause, i.e. God, is beyond reason; but on the assumption of God's goodness and of our immortality, which are proved by reason, we feel sure that there must be a Revelation. Lastly, the proof that Scripture is this Revelation comes (a) from the testimony of the Church, (b) from the light in Scripture itself. Thus our acceptance of Scripture springs from our faith and trust in God.

As for the Jesuits; if they accept the Scripture on the authority of the Church, whence do they get grounds for accepting the authority of the Church? They can only answer it is based on Scripture, which makes a vicious circle of argument.]

XXXIV.—To gather up whatsoever may seem scattered in this long discourse, to prove that Scripture is the word of God, I shall now, in the last place, put all together, that so the whole state of the question may the better appear.

[CHAPTER V.]

First, then, I shall desire the reader to consider, that every rational science requires some principles quite without its own limits, which are not proved in that science, but presupposed. Thus rhetoric presupposes grammar, and music, arithmetic. Therefore it is most reasonable that Theology should be allowed to have some principles also, which she proves not, but presupposes.[1] And the chiefest of these is, That the Scriptures are of divine authority.

Secondly, That there is a great deal of difference in the manner of confirming the principles of divinity, and those of any other art or science whatsoever.

For the principles of all other sciences do finally resolve, either into the conclusions of some higher science, or into those principles which are *per se nota*, "known by their own light," and are the grounds and principles of all science. And this is it, which properly makes them sciences, because they proceed with such strength of demonstration, as forces reason to yield unto them. But the principles of divinity resolve not into the grounds of natural reason,—for then there would be no room for faith, but all would be either knowledge or vision,—but, into the maxims of divine knowledge supernatural. And of this we have just so much light, and no more, than God hath revealed unto us in the Scripture.

Thirdly, That though the evidence of these supernatural truths, which divinity teaches, appears not so manifest as that of the natural; yet they are in themselves much more sure and infallible than they.[2] For they proceed immediately from God, that

[1] Omnis scientia præsupponit fidem aliquam. [Every science presupposes some faith.]—S. Prosper. *in Psalm.* cxxiii. [This passage is not to be found under Psalm cxxiii. Dr. Scott suggests that the passage alluded to by Laud in citing this maxim may be: Vide igitur Deum primo per fidem, ut postea possis videre per speciem. Therefore, see God first by faith, in order that afterwards you may see Him by sight.—S. Prosper. Aquitan. *Expos. in Ps.* cxx. 4. *Op.*, col. 466. D. ed. Paris. 1711. Migne, 365.] And S. Cyril. Hierosolym. *Cateches.* v. [cap. 3. (al. 2.) *Op.*, p. 72. E. Migne, 508,] shews how all things in the world do *fide consistere* [rest on faith]. Therefore most unreasonable to deny that to divinity, which all sciences, nay all things, challenge: namely, some things to be presupposed and believed.

[2] Si vis credere manifestis, invisibilibus magis quam visibilibus oportet credere. Licet dictum sit admirabile, verum est, etc. [If you wish to believe what is evident, the invisible ought to be believed much more than the visible. Although it is called marvellous, it is true.]—S. Chrysostom. *Hom.* xlvi. *ad Pop.* [*i.e. in S. Matth. Homil.* xiii. vide infra, note 12.] And there he proves it. — Aliæ scientiæ certitudinem habent ex naturali lumine rationis humanæ, quæ potest errare: hæc (sc. Theologia) autem [certitudinem habet] ex lumine

Heavenly Wisdom, which being the fountain of ours, must needs infinitely precede ours, both in nature and excellence. "He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not He know?"[3] And therefore, though we reach not the order of their deductions, nor can in this life come to the vision of them, yet we yield as full and firm assent, not only to the articles, but to all the things rightly deduced from them, as we do to the most evident principles of natural reason. This assent is called faith; and "faith being of things not seen," would quite lose its honour,[4] nay itself, if it met with sufficient grounds in natural reason whereon to stay itself. For faith is a mixed act of the will and the understanding; and the will inclines the understanding[5] to yield full approbation to that whereof it sees not full proof. Not but that there is most

SECTION XVI.

Ps. xciv. [10.]

Heb. xi. 1.

divinæ scientiæ, quæ decipi non potest. [Other branches of knowledge have their certainty from the natural light of human reason, which can err, but this, *i.e.* theology, has its certainty from the light of Divine knowledge, which cannot go wrong.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Secund.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 5. in conclus.

[3] *Psal.* xciv. 10. Our old English translation reads it, "Shall not He punish?" that is, Shall not He know when, and why, and how to punish?

[4] Si sit ratio convincens, et propter eam quis credat, alias non crediturus, tollitur meritum fidei. [Supposing there is convincing reason, and a man believes because of it, but would not believe otherwise, the merit of Faith is taken away.]—[Gabr.] Biel. in III. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] unica [Dub. 4. T.] in fine.—Non est dicendus credere, cujus judicium subigitur aut cogitur. [A man cannot be said to believe when his judgment is subdued or compelled.]—Stapleton. *Triplicat. adversus Whitaker.* [*pro ecclesiæ auctoritate,*] cap. vi. p. 64. {*Op.*, tom. i. p. 1157. A.]

[5] Est enim fides [voluntaria,] nec fit in nobis nisi volentibus. [For faith is voluntary and only grows in us when we are willing.]—[Cardinal.] Tolet. *in S. Johan.* xvi. Annot. 33. [seu potius, 13. *Comment. in Johan. Evangel.* tom. i. col. 154. F. ed. Lugd. 1615.] Qui voluerunt crediderunt, [quamvis in quem crediderunt non viderunt. Those, who wished, believed, although they did not see Him in Whom they believed.]—S. Augustin. *Serm.* lx. *de verb. Dom.* cap. 5. [*Serm.* cxliii. *de verbis Evangelii Johan.* xvi. Ego veritatem, etc. *Op.*, tom. v. col. 693. A. Migne, v. 787]—Fides actus est non solius intellectus, sed etiam voluntatis, quæ cogi non potest; imo magis voluntatis quam intellectus: sed etiam, quatenus illa operationis principium est, et assensum, qui proprie fidei actus est, sola elicit; nec ab intellectu voluntas, sed a voluntate intellectus, in actu fidei determinatur. [Faith is an act not of the intellect alone, but also of the will, which cannot be under compulsion: yea it has more to do with the will than with the intellect, and in so far as the will is the beginning of the matter, it also alone secures the assent which is properly an act of faith: nor is the will determined by the intellect, but the intellect by the will in the act of faith.]—Stapleton. *Triplicat. adversus Whitaker.* cap. vi. etc. [*ubi sup.* note 4]—Credere . . . actus est intellectus determinati ad unum ex imperio voluntatis. [To believe is an act of the intellect determined to the one thing by the power of the will.]—Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] iv. A[rt.] 1. in conclus.—Non potest dari aliquis assensus fidei, quicunque sit ille, qui non dependeat in suis causis mediate vel immediate ab actu voluntatis. [No assent of faith, whatever it is, can be given which does not depend in its causes, mediately or immediately, on an act of the will.]—Jac. Almain. *in*

[CHAPTER V.] full proof of them, but because the main grounds which prove them are concealed from our view, and folded up in the unrevealed counsel of God; God in Christ resolving to bring mankind to their last happiness by faith, and not by knowledge, that so the weakest among men may have their way to blessedness open. And certain it is, that many weak men believe themselves into heaven, and many over-knowing Christians lose their way thither, while they will believe no more than they can clearly know. In which pride and vanity of theirs they are left, and have these things "hid from them."

Matt. xi. 25.

Fourthly, That the credit of the Scripture, the book in which the principles of faith are written, as of other writings also, depends not upon the subservient inducing cause that leads us to the first knowledge of the author, which leader here is the Church; but upon the author himself, and the opinion we have of his sufficiency, which here is the Holy Spirit of God, whose penmen the Prophets and Apostles were. And therefore the mysteries of divinity contained in this book, as the incarnation of our Saviour, the resurrection of the dead, and the like, cannot finally be resolved into the sole testimony of the Church, who is but a subservient cause to lead to the knowledge of the author, but into the wisdom and sufficiency of the author, Who being omnipotent and omniscient, must needs be infallible.

Fifthly, That the assurance we have of the penmen of the Scriptures, the holy Prophets and Apostles, is as great as any can be had of any human authors of like antiquity. For it is morally as evident to any pagan, that St. Matthew and St. Paul writ the Gospel and Epistles which bear their names, as that Cicero or Seneca wrote theirs. But that the Apostles were divinely inspired whilst they writ them, and that they are the very word of God expressed by them, this hath ever been a matter of faith in the Church, and was so even while the Apostles themselves lived,[6]

III. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Conclus. 6. Dub. 4. fol. lxxix.—And St. Augustine says, Fidei locum esse cor. [The heart is the abode of faith.]—Tractat. lii. 8. *in S. Johan.* [cap. xii. *Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 642. D. Migne, iii. 1772.] Where the heart is put for the whole soul, which equally comprehends both the will and the understanding.—And so doth [Gabr.] Biel. also in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.]unic. Art. i. [Coroll. 4.] F.

[6] The Apostles, indeed, they "knew," for they had clear revelation: they to whom they preached might believe, but they could not know without the like revelation. So *St. John* xix. 35. "He that saw knows that he says true, that you, which saw not, might believe."—Deus in Prophetis, et sic in Apostolis, quos immediate illuminabat, causabat evidentiam. [God produced the evidence in the Prophets and also in the Apostles, whom He

and was never a matter of evidence and knowledge, at least as knowledge is opposed to faith. Nor could it at any time then be more demonstratively proved than now. I say, not *scientifice*, not demonstratively: for, were the Apostles living, and should they tell us that they spake and writ the very oracles of God, yet this were but their own testimony of themselves, and so not alone able to enforce belief on others. And for their miracles, though they were very great inducements of belief, yet were neither they evident and convincing proofs, alone and of themselves; both because there may be counterfeit miracles,[7] and because true ones are neither infallible nor inseparable marks of truth in doctrine.[8]

Himself directly illuminated.]—Jac. Almain. in III. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] unic. Conclus. 6. But for the residue of men, it is no more, but as Thomas hath it: Oportet quod credatur auctoritati eorum, quibus revelatio facta est. [We ought to believe the authoritative witness of those men to whom the revelation was given.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 8. [Migne, i. 467.]

[7] Non est evidens vel ista esse vera miracula, vel ista fieri ad illam veritatem comprobandam. [It is not clear either that they were true miracles or that they were worked in order to prove that truth.]—Jac. Almain. in III. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] unic. Concl. 6. Therefore the miracles which Christ and His Apostles did, were fully sufficient to beget faith to assent, but not evidence to convince.

[8] Cautos nos fecit sponsus, quia et miraculis decipi non debemus. [The bridegroom made us cautious, because even miracles ought not to be able to draw us away.]—S. Augustin. *in S. Johan. Evang.* [cap. iii. 29.] Tractat. xiii. 17. [in illa verba, Post hæc venit Jesus, etc. *Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 399. A. Migne, iii. 1501.] And he that says we ought not to be deceived, acknowledges that we may be deceived, even by miracles. And arguments which can deceive are not sufficient to convince, though they be sometimes too full of efficacy to pervert. And so plainly Almain out of Ocham. Nunquam acquiritur evidentia per medium quod de se generat falsum assensum sicut verum. [Proof is never gained by a means which produces a false assent to its own truthfulness.]—Jac. Almain. in III. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] unic. Conc. 6. [*ubi sup.* note 7]. And therefore that learned Roman Catholic, who tells us the Apostles' miracles made it evident that their doctrine was true and divine, went too far. "Credible" they made it, but not "evident." And therefore he is after forced to confess "that the soul sometimes assents not to the miracles, but in great timidity, which cannot stand with clear evidence." And after again, "that the soul may renounce the doctrine formerly confirmed by miracles, unless some inward and supernatural light be given, etc." And neither can this possibly stand with evidence. And therefore Bellarmine goes no further than this: Quod miracula sint [necessaria] ad novam fidem [vel extraordinariam missionem] persuadendam. Efficacia et sufficientia, etc. [Miracles are necessary to persuade us to a new faith or to an extraordinary mission; and for this purpose they are potent and sufficient.] —[Bellarmin.] *de notis ecclesiæ*, lib. iv. cap. 14. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 206. D.] To induce and persuade, but not to convince. And Thomas will not grant so much, for he says expressly [Laud's quotation of Thomas Aq. gives the sense; it is not literal]: Miraculum non est sufficiens causa inducens fidem: quia videntium unum et idem miraculum, quidam credunt, et quidam non [credunt. A miracle is not a sufficient reason to induce faith; because among men seeing one and the same miracle, some believe and some do not believe.] —Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.*

[CHAPTER V.] Not infallible, for they may be marks of false doctrine in the highest degree: not proper and inseparable, for all which wrote by inspiration did not confirm their doctrine by miracles.[9] For we do not find that David, or Solomon, with some other of the prophets, did any; neither were any wrought by St. John the Baptist. So, as credible signs, they were, and are still, of as much force to us as it is possible for things on the credit of relation to be: for the witnesses are many, and such as spent their lives in making good the truth which they saw. But that the workers of them were divinely and infallibly inspired in that which they preached and writ, was still to the hearers a matter of faith,[10] and no more evident, by the light of human reason, to men that lived in those days than to us now. For, had that been demonstrated or been clear, as prime principles are, in its own light, both they and we had apprehended all the mysteries of divinity by knowledge, not by faith. But this is most apparent was not. For, had the Prophets or Apostles been ordered by God to make this demonstratively or intuitively, by discourse or vision, appear as clear to their auditors as to themselves it did, that whatsoever they taught was divine and infallible truth, all men which had the true use of reason must have been forced to yield to their doctrine. Isaiah could never have been at *Domine quis?* "Lord, who hath

Deut. xiii. 1-3. 2 Thess. ii. 9. Mark xiii. 22.

John x. 41.

Isa. liii. 1.

Q[uæst.] vi. A[rt.] 1. in conclus. [Migne, iii. 65.]—And Ambrosius Catharinus, in *Rom.* x. 15, is downright at Nulla fides est habenda signo: examinanda sunt. [No faith must be put in miracles . . . they must be examined.]—[Ambros. Catharin. *in omnes Divi Pauli Epistolas*, etc. p. 100. ed. Paris. 1566.]—And Anastasius Nicænus Episcopus, apud Baron. ad An. 360. Num. 21.—Non sint necessaria signa veræ fidei. [Miracles are not necessary to a true faith.] Suarez, *defensio fidei Catholicæ*, [*contra Anglican.* etc.] lib. i. cap. vii. § 3. [col. 34. F. ed. Colon. 1614.]

[9] Operatio virtutum alteri datur, *1 Cor.* xii. 10. To one and another, he saith, not to all, is given the working of miracles.—Fugare dæmonia, mortuos suscitare . . . dedit quibusdam discipulis suis, quibusdam non dedit: (*i.e.* to do miracles). [He gave to some of His disciples the power to put devils to flight, and to raise the dead; to others He did not give this power.] —S. Augustin. Serm. xxii. *de verbis Apostol.* cap. 5. [Serm. clxiv. *de verbis Apostol. Gal.* vi. Invicem onera vestra, etc. cap. 5. *Op.*, tom. v. col. 792. G. Migne, v. 898.]

[10] Here it may be observed how warily A. C. carries himself. For when he hath said, "that a clear revelation was made to the Apostles," which is most true; and so the Apostles knew that which they taught *simpliciter a priori*, most demonstratively from the prime cause, God Himself: then he adds, p. 51, "I say, clear *in attestante.*" That is, the revelation of this truth was clear in the Apostles that witnessed it. But to make it knowledge in the auditors, the same, or like revelation, and as clear, must be made to them. For they could have no other "knowing" assurance: "credible" they might, and had. So A. C. is wary there, but comes not home to the business; and so might have held his peace. For the question is not, What clear evidence the Apostles had? but, What evidence they had which heard them?

believed our report?" Nor Jeremy at *Domine, factus sum*, "Lord, I am in derision daily." Nor could any of St. Paul's auditors have "mocked at him," as some of them did, for "preaching the resurrection," if they had had as full a view as St. Paul himself had in "the assurance," which God gave of it, in and by "the resurrection of Christ."[11] But the way of knowledge was not that which God thought fittest for man's salvation. For man having sinned by pride, God thought fittest to humble him at the very root of the tree of knowledge, and make him deny his understanding, and submit to faith, or hazard his happiness. The credible object all the while, that is, the mysteries of religion and the Scripture which contain them, is divine and infallible; and so are the penmen of them by revelation. But we and all our forefathers, the hearers and readers of them, have neither knowledge nor vision of the prime principles in or about them, but faith only.[12] And the revelation, which was clear to them, is not so to us, nor therefore the prime tradition itself delivered by them.

Jer. xx. 7. Acts xvii. 32.

[11] *Acts* xvii. 32. And had Zedekiah and the people seen it as clearly as Jeremy himself did, that the word he spake was God's word and infallible, Jerusalem, for aught we know, had not been laid desolate by the Chaldeans. But because they could not see this by the way of knowledge, and would not believe it by way of faith, they, and that city, perished together. *Jer.* xxxviii. 17.

[12] Scriptura testatur, cui nemo pius nisi qui credit. [The Scripture gives the evidence in which every pious man believes.]—S. Augustin. *contra Faustum*, lib. xxvi. cap. 6. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 437. F.] Now no man believes the Scripture, that doth not believe that it is the word of God. I say, which doth not "believe"; I do not say, which doth not "know." Oportet quod credatur auctoritati eorum quibus revelatio facta est. [We ought to believe the authoritative witness of those men to whom the revelation was given.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 8. ad secundum; [Migne, i. 467. *ubi sup.* p. 123. note 6.]—*ὅτι δὲ ψυχὴν ἔχομεν [πόθεν δῆλον; εἰ γὰρ δὴ τοῖς ὁρωμένοις μέλλεις πιστεύειν, καὶ περὶ θεοῦ, καὶ περὶ ἀγγέλων, καὶ περὶ νοῦ, καὶ περὶ ψυχῆς ἀμφιβάλλεις, καὶ οὕτως σοι πάντα οἰχήσεται τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας δόγματα. καίτοιγε εἰ τοῖς φανεροῖς πιστεύειν βουλεύει, τοῖς ἀοράτοις μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ὁρωμένοις πιστεύειν δεῖ· εἰ καὶ παράδοξον τὸ εἰρημένον, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἀληθές, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς νοῦν ἔχουσι σφόδρα ὡμολογημένον.* But what is the evidence that we have a soul? Well, do you wish only to believe in things seen, and do you have doubts about God and about angels, and about the mind; thus all the dogmas of truth will fade away for you. Nevertheless, if you decide to believe things which are evident, you ought to believe things which are unseen more than things which are seen; and though it sounds like a paradox, none the less it is true, and generally acknowledged by people of intelligence.—S. Chrysostom. *in Matt. Homil.* xiii. *Op.*, tom. vii. p. 175. C.] Quod vero animam habemus, unde manifestum? Si enim visibilibus credere velis, et de Deo, et de angelis, et de mente, et de anima dubitatis; et sic tibi omnia veritatis dogmata deperibunt. Et certe si manifestis credere velis, invisibilibus magis quam visibilibus credere oportet. Licet enim admirabile sit dictum, verum tamen, et apud mentem habentes valde certum, vel in confesso.—Ex Homil. xiii. S. Chrysostom. *in S. Matt.* [*Op.*,] tom. i. edit. Front. [Ducæi,] Paris. 1636.

[CHAPTER V.]

Sixthly, That hence it may be gathered that the assent which we yield to this main principle of divinity, "that the Scripture is the word of God," is grounded upon no compelling or demonstrative ratiocination, but relies upon the strength of faith more than any other principle whatsoever.[13] For all other necessary points of divinity may, by undeniable discourse, be inferred out of Scripture itself, once admitted; but, this concerning the authority of Scripture, not possibly: but must either be proved by revelation, which is not now to be expected; or presupposed and granted as manifested in itself, like the principles of natural knowledge, which reason alone will never grant; or by tradition of the Church both prime and present, with all other rational helps, preceding or accompanying the internal light in Scripture itself, which though it give light enough for faith to believe, yet light enough it gives not to be a convincing reason and proof for knowledge. And this is it which makes the very entrance into divinity inaccessible to those men, who, standing high in the opinion of their own wisdom, will believe nothing but that which is irrefragably proved from rational principles. For as Christ requires a denial of a man's self, that he may be able to follow Him: so as great a part as any of this denial of his whole self, for so it must be, is the denial of his understanding, and the composing of the unquiet search of this grand inquisitor into the secrets of Him that made it, and the overruling the doubtfulness of it by the fervency of the will.[14]

Luke ix. 23.

Seventhly, That the knowledge of the supreme cause of all, which is God, is most remote, and the most difficult thing reason can have to do with. The *quod sit*, that there is a God, blear-eyed reason can see;[15] but the *quid sit*, what that God is, is

[13] And this is the ground of that which I said before, Sect. xv. No. 1, that the Scripture only, and not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of our faith: namely, when the authority of Scripture is first yielded unto.

[14] Intellectus credentis determinatur [ad unum] non per rationem, [sed] per voluntatem. [The intellect of the believer is brought to agreement not by the reason but by the will.]—Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] ii. A[rt.] 1. ad tertium. [Migne, iii. 29. *ubi sup.* p. 87. note 62.] And what power the will hath in case of men's believing, or not believing, is manifest, *Jer.* xliv. But this is spoken of the will compared with the understanding only, leaving the operations of grace free over both.

[15] Communis enim sententia est patrum et theologorum aliorum, demonstrari posse naturali ratione Deum esse; sed a posteriori et per effectus. [For this is the general opinion of the fathers and other theologians that God's existence can be proved by natural reason; but as an inference and because of what He effects.]—Sic Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] p. 1. Q[uæst.] ii. A[rt.] 2. [Migne, i. 473.]—Et, [S. Joann.]

infinitely beyond all the fathoms of reason.[16] He is a light indeed, but such as no man's reason can come at for the brightness.[17] If anything, therefore, be attainable in this kind it must be by revelation,[18] and that must be from Himself: for none can

SECTION XVI.

1 Tim. vi. [16.]

Damascen. *Orthodox. Fid.* lib. i. cap. 3. [tom. i. p. 125. C. ed. Lequien. Migne, i. 793. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ θεὸς, τοῖς μὲν τὰς ἁγίας γραφὰς δεχομένοις, τήν τε παλαίαν καὶ καινὴν διαθήκην, φημὶ, οὐκ ἀμφιβάλλεται, οὔτε δὲ τοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλείστοις· ὡς γὰρ ἔφημεν, ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ εἶναι θεὸν φυσικῶς ἡμῖν ἐγκατέσπαρται. Now that God exists, is not doubted, I say, by those who accept the Holy Scriptures, the old and the new Testament, nor yet by the majority of Greeks: for as we said, the knowledge of God's existence is planted in us by nature.]—Et, [Jac.] Almain. in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] unic. [Almain implies the same, but denies that the natural knowledge of God is that of demonstration: he says, Illa propositio, "Deus est," est demonstrabilis apud beatos, et non apud viatores: cum non possint habere medium per quod demonstraretur: puta notitiam simplicem et incomplexam Dei. That proposition, "God is," can be demonstrated to those who are in bliss, but not to the wayfarers, since these have no means by which it can be demonstrated; think of the simple and uninvolved nature of God. —fol. lxxiiij.]—But what may be demonstrated by natural reason, by natural light may the same be known. And so the Apostle himself, Rom. i. 20. Invisibilia Dei a creatura mundi per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur. [The invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made.] And so Calvin most clearly, *Instit.* lib. i. cap. 5. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 5.] Aperire oculos nequeant, quin aspicere Eum cogantur. [They cannot open their eyes without being compelled to see Him:] though Bellarmine would needs be girding at him, *de Gratia et libero Arbitrio*, lib iv. cap. 2.—Videtur autem et ratio iis quæ apparent attestari: Omnes enim homines de Diis (ut ille loquitur) habent existimationem.—Aristot. *de Cælo*, lib. i. cap. 22. [Ἔοικε δ' ὁ τε λόγος τοῖς φαινομένοις μαρτυρεῖν, καὶ τὰ φαινόμενα τῷ λόγῳ. Πάντες γὰρ ἀνθρώποι περὶ θεῶν ἔχουσιν ὑπόληψιν, καὶ πάντες τὸν ἀνωτάτω τῷ θείῳ τόπον ἀποδιδόασι, καὶ βάρβαροι καὶ Ἕλληνες, ὅσοιπερ εἶναι νομίζουσι θεούς. Reason seems to give evidence of the things which appear; and the things which appear seem to give evidence to Reason. For all men have a notion about the Gods, and all men give the highest place to the Godhead, Barbarian and Greek, as many as think there are Gods.—Aristot. *de Cælo*, lib. i. cap. 3. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 217. ed. Bekker.]

[16] [Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ θεὸς, δῆλον· τί δὲ ἐστὶ κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ φύσιν, ἀκατάληπτον τοῦτο παντελῶς, καὶ ἄγνωστον. That there is a God is plain enough; but His Being and Nature, this can by no means be comprehended or understood. S. Joann.] Damascen. *Orthodox. Fid.* lib. i. cap. 4. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 127. A. ed. Lequien. Migne, i. 797.]

[17] *1 Tim.* vi. 16. Et ne vestigium sic accedendi relinquit S. Augustinus. [his verbis sc.] Nec si augeas imaginatione cogitationis lucem solis innumerabiliter, [neque hoc est Deus.] . . . nec tale aliquid [Deus est. Does Augustine leave a trace of reaching Him in this way? With these words he speaks. And not even if you were to increase by the imagination of your heart the light of the sun to a countless extent, would this be God, nor is any such thing God.—S. Augustin.] *de Trinit.* lib. viii. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 867. C.] Solus modus accedendi, preces sunt. [The only way of reaching Him is by prayer.] Boetius, *de Consolatione Philosophiæ*, lib. v. prosa. 3. [*Op.*, p. 1103. ed. Basil. 1570.]

[18] Quæ rationem humanam excedunt . . . Necessarium igitur fuit, præter philosophicas disciplinas, quæ per rationem investigantur sacram doctrinam per revelationem haberi. [Things which exceed human reason (had to be made known to man for his salvation). Therefore it was necessary that besides the natural sciences

[CHAPTER V.] reveal but he that comprehends;[19] and none doth or can comprehend God but Himself.[20] And when He doth reveal, yet He is no further discernible than Himself pleases.[21] Now, since reason[22] teaches that the soul of man is immortal and capable of felicity;[23]

which reason examines, there should be sacred teaching given by Revelation.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 1. [Migne, i. 459.]

[19] And therefore Biel is express, That God could not reveal anything that is to come, nisi illud esset a Deo præscitum seu prævisum (*i.e.* unless God did fully comprehend that which He doth reveal).—[Gabr.] Biel. in III. *Sent.* D[istinct.] xxiii. Q[uæst.] ii. A[rt.] 1.

[20] Nullus [igitur] intellectus creatus videndo Deum, potest cognoscere omnia quæ Deus facit, vel potest facere. Hoc enim esset comprehendere Ejus virtutem. [No created intelligence, then, in seeing God, can know all the things which God does or can do. For this would be to understand His power.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] xii. A[rt.] 8. in conclus. [Migne, i. 548.] Ad argumentum: omnia quæcunque fiunt, vel fieri possunt, in Deo resplendent, sicut in quodam speculo: respondet Thom. Ad secundum quod non est necessarium quod videns speculum omnia in speculo videat, nisi speculum visu suo comprehendat. [To come to the argument: All things which are made, or can be made, shine in God, as it were in a great mirror; answers Thomas. Secondly, it is not necessary, that seeing the mirror he should see all that is in the mirror, unless his vision could take in all the mirror.]—Thom. [Aquin.] ubi sup. A[rt.] 8. *ad Secundum.* Migne, i. 548. Nemo autem Deum comprehendit. [Now no man can comprehend (this mirror, which is) God Himself.]

[21] Deus enim est speculum voluntarium, revelans quæ et quot vult alicui beato: non est speculum naturaliter repræsentans omnia. [For God is a mirror by His free will, revealing what and as much as He pleases to any of the blessed; He is not a mirror reflecting everything in a natural fashion.]—[Gabr.] Biel. *Suppl. in IV. Sent.* [per Wendelinum Stambachum ejus auditorem collectum,] D[istinct.] xlix. Q[uæst.] iii. propos. 3. [fol. cclxxi. col. 3. ed. Paris. 1521.]

[22] For if reason well put to its search did not find this out, how came Aristotle to affirm this by rational disquisition? *Λείπεται δὲ τὸν νοῦν [μόνον θύραθεν ἐπεισιέναι καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον· οὐθὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κοινωνεῖ σωματικὴ ἐνέργεια.]* Restat, ut mens sola extrinsecus accedat, eaque, sola divina sit, nihil enim cum ejus actione communicat actio corporalis. [But it remains that the mind alone enters from outside, and it alone is divine; for the powers of the body have no share in its powers.]—Aristot. *de generatione animalium*, lib. ii. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. v. p. 248. ed. Bekker.] This cannot be spoken of the soul, were it mortal. And therefore I must needs be of Paulus Benius's opinion, who says plainly, and proves it too, Turpiter affixam a quibusdam Aristoteli mortalitatis animæ opinionem. [Some men have basely attributed to Aristotle a belief that the soul is mortal.]—[Pauli] Benii [Eugubini] *in Timæum Platonis Decad[es tres,]* Decad. Primæ, lib. iii. [p. 126. ed. Romæ, 1594.]

[23] For if reason did not dictate this also, whence is it that Aristotle disputes of the way and means of attaining it? Lib. i. *Moral.* cap. 9.—[Aristot. *Ethic. Nicomach.* lib. i. cap. 9. *Op.*, tom. ix. p. 18. ed. Bekker.] And takes on him to prove, That felicity is rather an honourable than a commendable thing. cap. 12.—[ibid. p. 20.] And after all this he adds, Deo beata tota vita est, hominibus autem eatenus, quatenus similitudo quædam ejusmodi operationis ipsis inest.—Aristot. lib. x. *Moral.* cap. 8. . . . *[τοῖς μὲν γὰρ θεοῖς ἅπας ὁ βίος μακάριος· τοῖς δ' ἀνθρώποις, ἐφ' ὅσον ὁμοιωμά τι τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ὑπάρχει.* For the whole life of the Gods is happy; and man's life too so far as there is any likeness in it to the power of God.—Aristot. *Ethic. Nicomach.* lib. x. cap. 8. *Op.*, tom. ix. p. 212.]

SECTION XVI.

and since that felicity consists in the contemplation of the highest cause, which again is God Himself; and since Christ therein confirms that dictate, that man's eternal happiness is to know God, and Him Whom He hath sent;[24] and since nothing can put us into the way of attaining to that contemplation but some revelation of Himself, and of the way to Himself; I say, since all this is so, it cannot reasonably be thought by any prudent man that the all-wise God should create man with a desire of felicity, and then leave him utterly destitute of all instrumental helps to make the attainment possible; since "God and nature do nothing but for an end,"[25] and help there can be none sufficient but by revelation; and once grant me that revelation is necessary, and then I will appeal to reason itself, and that shall prove abundantly one of these two: That either there was never any such revelation of this kind from the world's beginning to this day—and that will put the *frustra* upon God in point of man's felicity;—or, that the Scriptures which we now embrace as the word of God is that revelation. And that is it we Christians labour to make good against all atheism, profaneness and infidelity.

John xvii. [3.]

Last of all, To prove that the book of God, which we honour as His word, is this necessary revelation of God and His truth, which must, and is alone able to, lead us in the way to our eternal blessedness, or else the world hath none, comes in a cloud of witnesses; some for the infidel, and some for the believer; some for the weak in faith, and some for the strong, and some for all. For then first comes in the tradition of the Church—the present Church, so it is no heretical or schismatical belief; then the testimony of former ages, so it is no new belief; then the consent of times, so it is no divided or partial belief; then the harmony of the prophets, and them fulfilled, so it is not a "devised" but a

2 Pet. i. 16.

[24] Ultima beatitudo hominis consistit in quadam supernaturali Dei visione, ad quam quidem visionem homo pertingere non potest, nisi per modum addiscentis a Deo doctore. [The highest happiness of man consists in the supernatural vision of God, and to this vision man is only able to attain by learning about it under the tuition of God.]—*St. John* vi. 45.—Omnis qui audivit a Patre et didicit [venit ad Me. Every one who has heard the Father and learnt from Him cometh unto Me.]—Thom. [Aquin.] *Secund. Secund.* Q[uæst.] ii. A[rt.] 3. in conclus. [Migne, iii. 31.]

[25] Deus et natura nihil frustra faciunt. [ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ἡ φύσις οὐδὲν μάτην ποιοῦσιν. God and Nature do nothing but for an end.]—Aristot. *de Cælo*, lib. i. cap. 32. [cap. 4. in fin. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 219. ed. Bekker.]—Frustra autem est quod non potest habere suum usum. [But what cannot have any use is for no end.]—Thom. [Aquin.] *ibid.* [*i.e.* in Aristot. lib. *de Cælo et Mundo*, Lect. viii. p. 18. apud tom. ii. *Op.*, S. Thom. Aquin. ed. Venet. 1595.]

[CHAPTER V.]

forespoken belief; then the success of the doctrine contained in this book, so it is not a belief stifled in the cradle, but it hath spread through the world in despite of what the world could do against it, and increased from weak and unlikely beginnings to incredible greatness; then the constancy of this truth, so it is no moon-belief, for in the midst of the world's changes, it hath preserved its creed entire through many generations; then, that there is nothing carnal in the doctrine, so it is a chaste belief. And all along it hath gained, kept, and exercised more power upon the minds of men, both learned and unlearned, in the increase of virtue and repression of vice, than any moral philosophy or legal policy that ever was. Then comes the inward light and excellency of the text itself, and so it is no dark or dazzling belief. And it is an excellent text: for see the riches of natural knowledge which are stored up there as well as supernatural. Consider how things quite above reason consent with things reasonable. Weigh it well what majesty lies there hid under humility: what depth[26] there is with a perspicuity unimitable: what "delight"[27] it works in the soul that is devoutly exercised in it: how the sublimest wits find in it enough to amaze them, while the simplest want not enough to direct them:[28] and then we shall not wonder, if,—with the assistance of God's Spirit,[29] Who alone works faith and belief of the Scriptures and

[26] Quasi quidam [quippe] est fluvius, planus et altus, in quo et agnus ambulet, et elephas natet. [As if there was a great river, smooth and deep, in which a lamb walks and an elephant swims.]—S. Gregor. [Magn. *Epistola*,] Præfat. in Lib. Moral. [scil. Expos. in libr. Job.] cap. 4. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 5. E. ed. Benedict.]

[27] In lege Domini voluntas ejus. [In the law of the Lord is his delight.] —*Psa.* i. 2.—Dulcior super mel et favum. [Sweeter than honey and the honeycomb.]—*Psa.* xviii. 11. et passim.

[28] [Sed quia] multa dicuntur submissis et humi repentibus animis accommodatius, ut per humana in divina consurgant; multa etiam figurate, ut studiosa mens et quæsitis exerceatur utilius, et uberius lætetur inventis. [Many things are spoken most conveniently to humble souls which creep upon the ground, that they may rise by human knowledge to divine; many things too are spoken in parables, that the diligent mind may be fully furnished in its search, and more richly rewarded in its discoveries.]—S. Augustin. *de Moribus Eccl. Cathol.* [*et Manich.* lib. i.] cap. 17. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 698. F.]—Quia nihil sub spirituali sensu continetur Fidei necessarium, quod Scriptura per literalem sensum alicubi manifeste non tradat. [But nothing necessary to faith is contained hidden under the spiritual sense; all this the Scripture elsewhere delivers openly through the literal sense.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 10. Resp. ad 1mum. [Migne, i. 470.]

[29] Et credimus . . . ob alia multa certiora argumenta (quam est testimonium ecclesiæ), tum propter hoc potissimum, quod Spiritus Sanctus nobis intus has esse Dei voces persuadeat. [We believe on account of many other arguments more solid than the evidence of the Church; and most of all for this because the Holy Spirit persuades us that those inward voices

their divine authority, as well as other articles,—we grow up into a most infallible assurance; such an assurance as hath made many lay down their lives for this truth: such as that, "though an angel from heaven should preach unto us another Gospel," we would not believe him or it. No, though we should see as great and as many miracles done over again to dissuade us from it, as were at first to win the world to it. To which firmness of assent, by the operation of God's Spirit, the will confers as much or more strength, than the understanding clearness; the whole assent being an act of faith, and not of knowledge. And therefore the question should not have been asked of me by F. "How I knew?" but, "Upon what motives I did believe Scripture to be the word of God?" And I would have him take heed lest hunting too close after a way of knowledge, he lose the way of faith, and teach other men to lose it too.

Gal. i. 8.

So then the way lies thus, as far as it appears to me, The credit of Scripture to be divine, resolves finally into that faith which we have touching God Himself, and in the same order. For as that, so this, hath three main grounds, to which all other are reducible. The first is, the tradition of the Church: and this leads us to a reverend persuasion of it. The second is, the light of Nature: and this shows us how necessary such a revealed learning is, and that no other way it can be had. Nay more,[30] that all proofs brought against any point of faith, neither are nor can be demonstrations but soluble arguments. The third is, The light of the Text itself: in conversing wherewith, we meet with the Spirit of God[31] inwardly inclining our hearts, and sealing the full assurance of the sufficiency of all three unto us. And then, and not before, we are certain that the Scripture is the word of God, both by divine and by infallible proof. But our certainty is by faith,

are the voices of God.]—Whitaker, *Controv. de Sacra Scriptura*, Controvers. 1. [de Scripturæ auctoritate,] Q[uæst.] iii. cap. 8. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 325. col. 2.]

[30] Cum fides infallibili veritati innitatur: et ideo cum impossibile sit de vero demonstrari contrarium: sequitur omnes probationes, quæ contra fidem inducuntur, non posse esse demonstrationes, sed solubilia argumenta. [Since faith rests on infallible truth, and since therefore it is impossible that anything should be truly demonstrated which is contrary to it, it follows that all the arguments which are brought against faith cannot be demonstrations, but only arguments easily answered.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] part. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 8. in conclus. [Migne, i. 467.]

[31] Fidei ultima resolutio est in Deum illuminantem. [Faith is ultimately resolved into the enlightening power of God.]—S. Augustin. *cont. Fund.* cap. 14.—*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 160. E. *ubi sup.* p. 87 note 62.]

and so voluntary; not by knowledge of such principles as in the light of nature can enforce assent, whether we will or no.

I have said thus much upon this great occasion, because this argument is so much pressed without due respect to Scripture. And I have proceeded in a synthetical way, to build up the truth for the benefit of the Church, and the satisfaction of all men, Christianly disposed. Whereas, had I desired only to rid my hands of these captious Jesuits,—for certainly this question was captiously asked,—it had been sufficient to have restored the question, thus, "How do you know the testimony of the Church (by which, you say, you know Scripture to be the word of God) to be divine and infallible?" If they prove it by Scripture, as all of them do, and as A. C. doth, how do they know that Scripture to be Scripture? It is but a circular assurance of theirs, by which they found the Church's infallibility upon the testimony of the Scripture, and the Scripture's infallibility upon the testimony of the Church: that is upon the matter, the Church's infallibility upon the Church's infallibility. But I labour for edification, not for destruction. And now, by what I have here said I will weigh my answer, and his exception taken against it.

[CHAPTER VI.

In debates among Christians, the authority of Scripture must be assumed and granted by both sides.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

The authority of Scripture needs to be defended in arguing with the heathen; but not in arguing with Christians. Among them it must be treated as a praecognitum, an assumed principle. It is not self-evident; but it rests on a superior knowledge which is "the knowledge of God and the blessed in heaven." The history of the Church proves that the Scriptures have been handed down as the oracles of God, delivered to mankind by Christ and His Apostles. This is a point which can be demonstrated.] SECTION XVII.

A. The **B.** said, That the books of Scripture are principles to be supposed, and needed not to be proved.

B. Why, but did I say that this principle,—the books of Scripture are the word of God,—is to be supposed as needing no proof at all to a natural man? or to a man newly entering upon the faith? yea, or perhaps to a doubter, or weakling in the faith? Can you think me so weak? It seems you do. But sure I know there is a great deal of difference between ethnics that deny and deride the Scripture and men that are born in the Church. The first have a further way about to this principle; the other in their very Christian education suck it in, and are taught so soon as they are apt to learn it, that the books, commonly called the Bible or Scripture, are the word of God. And I dealt with you as with a Christian,[1] though in error, while you call Catholic. The § 17.

[1] Dixi sicut ei congruebat, ad quem scribebam. [I spoke as if he to whom I wrote agreed with it.]—S. Augustin. *Retractat.* lib. i. cap. 13. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 20. E.]

words before spoken by me were, "That the Scripture alone, not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of faith." The question between us and you is, "Whether the Scripture do contain all necessary things of faith?" Now in this question, as in all nature and art, the subject, the Scripture, is and must be supposed:[2] the query between the Roman Catholics and the Church of England being only of the predicate, the thing uttered of it, namely, whether it contain all fundamentals of faith, all necessaries for salvation within it? Now since the question, proposed in very form of art, proves not, but supposes the subject,[3] I think I gave a satisfying answer, That to you and me, and in this question, Scripture was a supposed principle, and needed no proof. And I must tell you, that in this question of the Scripture's perfect continent, it is against all art, yea, and equity too, in reasoning to call for a proof of that here, which must go unavoidably supposed in this question. And if any man will be so familiar with impiety to question it, it must be tried in a preceding question and dispute by itself. Yet here not you only, but Bellarmine[4] and others, run quite out of the way to snatch at advantage.

ℭ. Against this I read what I had formerly written in my reply against Mr. John White: wherein I plainly showed that this answer was not good, and that no other answer could be made, but by admitting some word of God unwritten to assure us of this point.

§ 18. ℭ. I. Indeed here you read out of a book, which you called your own, a large discourse upon this argument. But surely I so untied the knot of the argument that I set you to your book again. For yourself confess that against this you read what you had formerly written. Well, whatever you read there, certain it

[2] Nor is it such a strange thing to hear that Scripture is such a supposed principle among Christians. Quod a Scriptura evidenter deducitur, est evidenter verum, suppositis Scripturis. [What is evidently deduced from Scripture is evidently true, if the Scriptures are true.]—Bellarm. *de Eccl. Milit.* lib. iv. [*i.e.* de notis Ecclesiæ,] cap. 3. § 3. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 167. C.]

[3] De subjecto enim quæritur semper; non subjectum ipsum. [For we are always questioning about the subject; the subject itself we do not question.]

[4] Quarto, necesse est [nosse, extare libros aliquos vere divinos, quod certe nullo modo ex Scripturis haberi posset. Fourthly, it is necessary we should know that there are in existence some really divine books; and this certainly cannot be got out of the Scriptures. — Bellarmin.] *de verbo Dei.* lib. iv. cap. 4. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 175. B.] And the Jesuit here, apud A. C. p. 49.

is you do a great deal of wrong to Mr. Hooker[5] and myself, that, because we call it a supposed or presumed principle among Christians, you should fall by and by into such a metaphysical discourse[6] to prove, that that which is a *praecognitum*,[7] foreknown in science, must be of such light that it must be known of and by itself alone; and that the Scripture cannot be so known to be the word of God.

II. I will not now enter again into that discourse, having said enough already, how far the beam, which is very glorious, especially in some parts of Scripture, gives light to prove itself. You see neither Hooker, nor I, nor the Church of England, for aught I know, leave the Scripture alone to manifest itself by the light which it hath in itself. No; but when the present Church hath prepared and led the way, like a preparing morning light to sunshine, then, indeed, we settle for our direction, but not upon the first opening of the morning light, but upon the sun itself. Nor will I make needless inquiry how far, and in what manner, a *praecognitum*, or supposed principle in any science, may be proved in a higher, to which that is subordinate or accepted in a prime: nor how it may in divinity, where *prae-* as well as *post-cognita*, things fore-, as well as after-, known, are matters, and under the manner of faith, and not of science strictly: nor whether a *praecognitum*, a pre-supposed principle in faith, which rests upon divine authority, must needs have as much and equal light to natural reason, as prime principles have in nature, while they rest upon

[5] [*Eccl. Polit.*] Book iii. chap. viii. Sect. 14. *ubi sup.* p. 104.]

[6] Whereas Bellarmine says expressly, that in the controversies between you and us: non de metaphysicis subtilitatibus, quæ sine periculo ignorari, et interdum etiam cum laude oppugnari possunt, etc. [It is no question of metaphysical subtleties, of which we can be ignorant without danger, and which we can sometimes attack with applause.] —Bellarm. *Præfat. Operibus præfix.* § 3. [*Op.*, tom. i.]

[7] [Porro] his omnibus quæstionibus præmittenda erit controversia de verbo Dei. Neque enim disputari potest, nisi prius in aliquo communi principio cum adversariis conveniamus: convenit autem inter nos et omnes omnino hæreticos, verbum Dei esse regulam fidei, ex qua de dogmatibus judicandum sit: esse commune principium ab omnibus concessum, unde argumenta ducantur: [denique esse gladium spiritualem, qui in hoc certamine recusari non possit. Before all these questions, we must first consider the controversy about the Word of God. For no dispute can be conducted unless we first find some common ground with our adversaries; but all heretics agree entirely with us in this, that the Word of God is the rule of faith, by which dogmas must be decided: this is the common ground of principle admitted by all, and from this our arguments can be drawn—in short, this is the spiritual sword which none can reject in this contest.]—Bellarmin. *Præfat. Operibus præfix.* § ult. [*Op.*, tom. i.] And if it be *commune principium ab omnibus concessum*, then I hope it must be taken as a thing supposed, or as a *praecognitum*, in this dispute between us.

[CHAPTER VI.]

reason: nor whether it may justly be denied to have sufficient light because not equal. Your own school grants, "That in us, which are the subjects both of faith and knowledge, and in regard of the evidence given in unto us, there is less light, less evidence in the principles of faith, than in the principles of knowledge, upon which there can be no doubt."[8] But I think the school will never grant that the principles of faith, even this in question, have not sufficient evidence. And you ought not to do, as you did, without any distinction, or any limitation, deny a *praecognitum*, or prime principle in the faith, because it answers not in all things to the prime principles in science, in their light and evidence;—a thing in itself directly against reason.

III. Well, though I do none of this, yet first I must tell you that A. C. here steps in again and tells me, "That though a *praecognitum* in faith need not be so clearly known as a *praecognitum* in science, yet there must be this proportion between them, that, whether it be in science or in faith, the *praecognitum*, or thing supposed as known, must be *prius cognitum*, first known, and not need another thing pertaining to that faith or knowledge to be known before it. But the Scripture, saith he, needs tradition to go before it, and introduce the knowledge of it. Therefore the Scripture is not to be supposed as a *praecognitum*, and a thing fore-known." Truly I am sorry to see in a man very learned such wilful mistakes. For A. C. cannot but perceive, by that which I have clearly laid down before,[9] that I intended not to speak precisely of a *praecognitum* in this argument: but when I said, "Scriptures were principles to be supposed," I did not, I could not, intend, they were *prius cognitæ*, known before tradition; since I confess everywhere that tradition introduces the knowledge of them. But my meaning is plain—that the Scriptures are and must be principles supposed, before you can dispute this question, "Whether the Scriptures contain in them all things necessary to salvation."[10] Before which question it must necessarily be sup-

[8] Colligitur aperte ex Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 5. [Migne, i. 463.] Articulorum fidei veritas non potest nobis esse evidens absolute. [It is an evident conclusion from St. Thomas' writings that "the truth of the articles of faith cannot be absolutely evident to us."]--Bellarmin. *de notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv. cap. 3. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 167. C.]

[9] Sect. xvii. xviii. No. 2. [*ubi sup.* p. 133, and p. 135.]

[10] And my immediate words in the Conference, upon which the Jesuit asked, How I knew Scripture to be Scripture? were (as the Jesuit himself relates it, apud A. C. p. 48.) "That the Scripture only, not any unwritten tradition, was the foundation of our faith," Now the Scripture cannot be

posed and granted on both sides, that the Scriptures are the word of God. For if they be not, it is instantly out of all question, that they cannot include all necessaries to salvation. So it is a *praecognitum*, not to tradition, as A. C. would cunningly put upon the cause, but to the whole question of the Scriptures' sufficiency. And yet if he could tie me to a *praecognitum* in this very question, and provable in a superior science, I think I shall go very near to prove it in the next paragraph, and entreat A. C. to confess it too.

IV. And now having told A. C. this, I must secondly follow him a little further. For I would fain make it appear as plainly as in such a difficulty it can be made, what wrong he doth truth and himself in this case. And it is the common fault of them all. For when the Protestants answer to this argument—which, as I have showed, can properly have no place in the question between us about tradition—they[11] which grant this as a *praecognitum*, a thing foreknown—as also I do—were neither ignorant nor forgetful that things presupposed, as already known, in a science, are of two sorts: for either they are plain and fully manifest in their own light; or they are proved and granted already, some former knowledge having made them evident. This principle then—the Scriptures are the oracles of God—we cannot say is clear, and fully manifest to all men simply, and in self-light, for the reasons before given. Yet we say, after tradition hath been our introduction, the soul that hath but ordinary grace added to reason, may discern light sufficient to resolve our faith that the sun is there. This principle, then, being not absolutely and simply evident in itself, is presumed to be taught us otherwise. And if otherwise, then it must be taught in and by some superior science, to which Theology is subordinate. Now men may be apt to think, out of reverence, that Divinity can have no science above it. But your own school teaches me that it hath. "The sacred doctrine of Divinity in this sort is a science, because it proceeds out of principles that are known by the light of a superior knowledge, which is the knowledge of God and the

the only foundation of faith, if it contain not all things necessary to salvation; which the Church of Rome, denying against all antiquity, makes it now become a question. And in regard to this, my answer was, That the Scriptures are and must be principles supposed, and *praecognita*, before the handling of this question.

[11] Hooker, [*Eccl. Polit.*] Book iii. chap. viii. [Sect. 14. *ubi sup.* p. 104, and p. 135.]

[CHAPTER VI.]

blessed in heaven."[12] In this superior science this principle—the Scriptures are the oracles of God—is more than evident in full light. This superior science delivered this principle in full revealed light to the Prophets and Apostles: this infallible light of this principle made their authority derivatively divine.[13] By the same divine authority they wrote, and delivered the Scripture to the Church: therefore from them immediately the Church received the Scripture, and that uncorrupt, though not in the same clearness of light which they had. And yet, since no sufficient reason hath [been], or can be, given, that in any substantial thing it hath been corrupted,[14] it remains firm at this day, and that proved in

[12] Hoc modo sacra doctrina est scientia; quia procedit ex principiis notis lumine superioris scientiæ, quæ scilicet est scientia Dei et beatorum. [Unde sicut musica credit principia tradita sibi ab arithmetico, ita doctrina sacra credit principia revelata sibi a Deo. The Sacred Doctrine is a science in this way; because it proceeds from principles which are known by the light of a higher science, that is the science of God and of His saints in bliss. So just as music accepts principles delivered to it by arithmetic, so the Sacred Doctrine accepts principles revealed to it by God.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rt.] 2. [Migne, i. 460.]—And what says A. C. now to this of Aquinas? Is it not clear in him that this principle, The Scriptures are the word of God, of divine and most infallible credit, is a *praecognitum* in the knowledge of Divinity, and provable in a superior science, namely, the knowledge of God and the blessed in heaven? Yea, so clear, that, as I told you he would, A. C. confesses it, p. 51. But he adds: "That because no man ordinarily sees this proof, therefore we must go either to Christ, Who saw it clearly; or to the Apostles, to whom it was clearly revealed; or to them who by succession received it from the prime seers." So now because Christ is ascended, and the Apostles gone into the number of the blessed, and made in a higher degree partakers of their knowledge; therefore we must now only go unto their successors, and borrow light from the tradition of the present Church. For that we must do; and it is so far well. But that we must "rely upon this tradition, as divine and infallible, and able to breed in us divine and infallible faith," as A. C. adds, pp. 51, 52, is a proposition, which, in the times of the primitive Church, would have been accounted very dangerous, as indeed it is. For I would fain know why leaning too much upon tradition may not mislead Christians, as well as it did the Jews. But they, saith St. Hilary, Traditionis favore legis præcepta transgressi sunt. [By means of tradition they have broken the commands of the Law.]—[S. Hilar.] *Canon. xiv. in S. Matth.* [xv. 13. (al. *Comment. in S. Matth.* cap. xiv. 1.) *Op.*, col. 685. A. ed. Benedict.]—Yet to this height are they of Rome now grown, that the traditions of the present Church are infallible: and by out-facing the truth, lead many after them. And as it is, *Jer.* v. 31, "The prophets prophesy untruths, and the priests receive gifts, and My people delight therein: what will become of this in the end?"

[13] Non creditur Deus esse auctor hujus scientiæ, quia homines hoc testati sint in quantum homines nudo testimonio humano, sed in quantum circa eos effulsit virtus divina, et ita Deus eis, et sibi ipsi in eis, testimonium perhibuit. [God is not believed to be the author of this science, because men have testified to it by their bare human testimony; but because divine virtue shone forth round them; and so God bears witness to them and to Himself in them.]—Henr. a Gand. *Summ.* p[ar.] i. A[rt.] ix. Q[uæst.] 3. [§ 13. p. 180.]

[14] Corrumpi non possunt, quia in manibus sunt omnium Christianorum . . . quisquis [enim] hoc primitus ausus

the most supreme science; and therefore now to be supposed, at least by all Christians, that the Scripture is the word of God. So my answer is good, even in strictness, that this principle is to be supposed in this dispute. SECTION XVIII.

V. Besides, the Jews never had, nor can have, any other proof that the Old Testament is the word of God, than we have of the New. For theirs was delivered by Moses and the Prophets, and ours was delivered by the Apostles, which were Prophets too. The Jews did believe their Scripture by a Divine authority; for so the Jews argue themselves: "We know that God spake with Moses." And that, therefore, they could no more err in following Moses, than they could in following God Himself.[15] And Our Saviour seems to infer as much, where He expostulates with the Jews thus: "If you believe not Moses his writings, how should you believe Me?" Now how did the Jews know that God spake to Moses? How? why, apparently the same way that is before set down. First, By tradition. So St. Chrysostom: "We know why: By whose witness do you know? By the testimony of our ancestors."[16] But he speaks not of their immediate ancestors, but their prime, which were Prophets, and whose testimony was divine; into which, namely their writings, the Jews did resolve their faith. And even that Scripture of the Old Testament was a "light," and a "shining light," too; and, therefore, could not but be sufficient when tradition had gone before. And yet, though the Jews entered this way to their belief of the Scripture, they do not say, "*Audivimus*, We have heard that God spake to Moses," but, "We know it."[17] So they resolved their faith higher, and into a

John ix. 29.

John v. 47.

2 Pet. i. 19.

esset, multorum codicum vetustiorum collatione confutaretur: maxime, quia non una lingua, sed multis, Scriptura contineretur. Nonnullæ autem codicum mendositates, vel de antiquioribus, vel de lingua praecedente, emendantur. [They cannot be corrupted, because they are in every Christian's hands; and the man who first dared to do this would be confuted by the comparison of many more ancient copies; and most of all because the Scripture is found not in one tongue but in many. But we can put right some mistakes which exist in the copies, either from other copies, or out of the earlier language, from which the translation was made.]—S. Augustin. lib. xxxii. *cont. Faustum*, c. 16. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 459. D. *ubi sup.* p. 106, note 30.]

[15] Maldonat[us, *Comment.*] *in S. Joann.* ix. [29]. Itaque non magis errare posse eum sequentes, quam si Deum Ipsum sequerentur. [And so they could no more err in following him (Moses) than if they were following God Himself.]

[16] [S. Chrysostom.] *Hom. lvii. in S. Johann ix.* [29. Hom. lviii. *Op.*, tom. viii. p. 340. C.] ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν [ὅτι Μωσεῖ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός.] τίνος εἰπόντος; [τίνος ἀπαγγειλαντος;] τῶν προγόνων, φησί, τῶν ἡμετέρων. [We know that God spake unto Moses; who told us? who declared it to us? he replies, our fathers have told us.]

[17] S. Chrysostom. *ubi supra*: καὶ οὐκ

[CHAPTER VI.] more inward principle, than an ear to their immediate ancestors and their tradition. And I would willingly learn of you, if you can show it me, wherever any one Jew, disputing with another about their Law, did put the other to prove that the Old Testament was the word of God. But they still supposed it. And when others put them to their proof, this way they went. And yet you say:

§ 19. ℭ. That no other answer could be made, but by admitting some word of God unwritten, to assure us of this point.

𝔅. I think I have showed that my answer is good, and that no other answer need be made. If there were need, I make no question but another answer might be made to assure us of this point, though we did not admit of any word of God unwritten. I say, to assure us; and you express no more. If you had said, "to assure us by Divine faith," your argument had been the stronger. But if you speak of assurance only in the general, I must then tell you—and it is the great advantage which the Church of Christ hath against infidels—a man may be assured, nay infallibly assured by ecclesiastical and human proof. Men that never saw Rome, may be sure and infallibly believe that such a city there is, by historical and acquired faith. And if consent of human story can assure me this, why should not consent of Church story assure me the other, that Christ and His Apostles delivered this body of Scripture as the oracles of God? For Jews, enemies to Christ, they bear witness to the Old Testament; and Christians, through almost all nations, give in evidence to both Old and New.[18] And no Pagan, or other enemies of Christianity, can give such a worthy and consenting testimony for any authority upon which

εἴπαν, ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, [ὅτι Μωσεῖ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός,] ἀλλ' ὅτι οἴδαμεν. [And they did not say that we heard God spake to Moses, but that we know.]

[18] Tanta hominum et temporum consensione firmatum. [Confirmed by so large an agreement of men and years.]—S. Augustin. lib. *de moribus Eccles. Cathol.* [*et Manich.* lib. i.] cap. 29. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 707. F.] —Eos libros, qui quoquo modo se habent, sancti tamen divinarumque rerum pleni, prope totius generis humani confessione diffamantur. These Books which, whatever they are, at all events are holy, and full of divine matters, are published abroad by the agreement of almost the whole human race.]—S. Augustin. *de util. credendi*, cap. vii. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 56. B.] —S. Augustin. *contra Faustum*, lib. xiii. cap. 15. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 260. A. B.]

they rely, or almost for any principle which they have, as the Scripture hath gained to itself. And as is the testimony, which it receives "above all writings of all nations,"[19] so here is assurance in a great measure, without any divine authority, in a word written or unwritten. A great assurance, and it is infallible too; only then we must distinguish infallibility. For, first, a thing may be presented as an infallible object of belief, when it is true and remains so: for truth, *qua talis*, as it is truth, cannot deceive. Secondly, a thing is said to be infallible, when it is not only true, and remains so, actually, but when it is of such invariable constancy, and upon such ground, as that no degree of falsehood at any time, in any respect, can fall upon it. Certain it is that by human authority, consent, and proof, a man may be assured infallibly that the Scripture is the word of God, by an acquired habit of faith, *cui non subest falsum*, "under which nor error nor falsehood is": but he cannot be assured infallibly by divine faith, *cui subesse non potest falsum*, "into which no falsehood can come," but by a divine testimony.[20] This testimony is absolute in Scripture itself, delivered by the Apostles for the word of God, and so sealed to our souls by the operation of the Holy Ghost. That which makes way for this, as an introduction and outward motive,[21] is the tradition of the present Church; but that neither simply divine, nor sufficient alone into which we may resolve our faith, but only as is before[22] expressed.

II. And now to come close to the particular. The time was, before this miserable rent in the Church of Christ—which I think no true Christian can look upon but with a bleeding heart—that you and we were all of one belief. That belief was tainted, in

[19] Super omnes omnium gentium literas. [Above all the literature of all the nations.]—S. Augustin. *de civitate Dei*, lib. xi. cap. 1. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 271. D. Migne, vii. 315.]

[20] Incertum [ergo] esse non potest hos esse libros canonicos, [et habere pondus auctoritatis suæ, quibus Ecclesia declarata per omnes gentes, et ab apostolis propagata, testimonium certum reddit. There can be no question that these are Canonical Books, and have the weight of their authority, since the Church, proclaimed through every nation and spread abroad by the Apostles, gives her unwavering testimony to them.—Thom.] Waldens. *Doctrinal Fidei*, tom. i. lib. 2. art. ii. cap. 20. [No. 3. fol. 102. col. 1. ed. Paris. 1532.]

[21] Canus, *Loc. Theolog.* lib. ii. cap. 8. facit Ecclesiam causam sine qua non. [Makes the Church the cause sine qua non. His words are: Non est enim Ecclesiæ auctoritas ratio per se prorsus ad credendum, sed causa sine qua non crederemus. For the Church's authority is not simply the reason which conducts us to belief, but the cause (sine qua non) without which we should not believe.—P. 59. ed. Lovan. 1569.]

[22] Sect. xvi. [No. 6. *ubi sup.* p. 76.]

[CHAPTER VI.]

tract and corruption of times, very deeply. A division was made, yet so that both parts held the Creed, and other common principles of belief. Of these this was one of the greatest, "That the Scripture is the word of God":[23] for our belief of all things contained in it depends upon it. Since this division there hath been nothing done by us to discredit this principle. Nay, we have given it all honour, and ascribed unto it more sufficiency, even to the "containing of all things necessary to salvation," with *satis superque*;[24] enough and more than enough: which yourselves have not done, do not. And for begetting and settling a belief of this principle, we go the same way with you and a better besides. The same way with you; because we allow the tradition of the present Church to be the first inducing motive to embrace this principle: only we cannot go so far in this way as you, to make the present tradition always an infallible word of God unwritten; for this is to go so far in till you be out of the way. For tradition is but a lane in the Church: it hath an end, not only to receive us in, but another after, to let us out into more open and richer ground. And we go a better way than you; because after we are moved, and prepared, and induced by tradition, we resolve our faith into that written word, and God delivering it: in which we find materially, though not in terms, the very tradition that led us thither. And so we are sure by divine authority that we are in the way, because at the end we find the way proved. And do what can be done, you can never settle the faith of man about this great principle, till you rise to greater assurance than the present Church alone can give. And therefore once again to that known place of St. Augustine.[25] The words of the Father are, *Nisi commoveret*, "unless the authority of the Church moved me"; but not alone, but with other motives: else it were not *commovere*, "to move together." And the other motives are resolvers, though this be leader. Now, since we go the same way with you, so far as you go right;

[23] Sic in alia causa, S. Augustinus: inter omnes pene constet, aut certe, id quod satis est, inter me atque illos cum quibus nunc agitur hoc conveniat. [So on another subject St. Augustine says; nearly everyone agrees; at all events, and this is all we want, I and those with whom I am now dealing agree.]—*De moribus Eccl. Cathol.* [*et Manichæor.* lib. i.] cap. 4. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 689. F.]

[24] Vin. Lirinens. *contra Hæres.* cap. ii. [p. 5. Vincentius goes on to show the need of the Church as an interpreter of Scripture, for pæne quot homines sunt, tot illinc sententiæ. There are nearly as many opinions as there are men.]

[25] *Contr. Epist. Fund.* cap. v. [*ubi sup.* p. 94. note 1.]

and a better way than you, where you go wrong; we need not admit any other word of God than we do. And this ought to remain as a pre-supposed principle among all Christians, and not so much as come into this question, about the sufficiency of Scripture, between you and us.

[CHAPTER VII.

The Church of Rome is not "the True Church"; and is not "a Right Church."

[CHAPTER VII.] The Countess of Buckingham begins to feel despondent as to an agreement between the two disputants; and no doubt the discussion has got now far beyond her depth. She tries once more to put some quite practical question which should settle the whole difficulty. Her sympathies are on the side of Rome; and she carries out the Jesuit's advice by making an enquiry apparently innocent enough, "Was the Roman Church the right Church before Luther?" If Laud should agree on this with Fisher, she will have something to go upon. The question is one which needs to be so exactly defined that it is no wonder misunderstandings immediately arose as to how much was actually accepted by both sides; and as, we shall see, Laud and Fisher differ widely when they describe what was said.

The position taken up by Archbishop Laud gave great offence to the English Puritans. They considered Rome to be Antichrist, and fiercely resented the Archbishop's moderation. Dr. Hall, the Calvinist Bishop of Exeter and afterwards of Norwich, was also blamed for a like liberal treatment of the Roman Church.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER.

The Church of Rome can be acknowledged to be "a true Church," because it receives the Scriptures and the Sacraments: but it is a corrupt Church. In some things it is right, in some things it is wrong. Rome was not "the true Church" before Luther; it was then corrupt and tainted. The separation was not the fault of the Protestants, who are not so called for protesting against the Church of Rome, but for protesting against the Roman errors and superstitions. They were thrust away from connection with Rome by her act of excommunication. Two passages quoted by Fisher from St. Bernard and from St. Augustine are then examined and do not apply blame to the Protestants.

The Faith is Catholic, not merely Roman. The whole Church cannot fall into deadly error, it is true. It may err partially but not totally for "the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." Rome was the first cause of the separation: and as for the Council of Trent, the Roman invitation to the Protestants to attend it, was merely with the intention of entrapping and destroying them (as in the case of Huss at Constance). The English Church seeks peace and truth. And though corruption of manners would not be enough alone to justify separation, corruption of doctrine is a sufficient cause. And as a General Council could not be obtained, each National Church had to reform itself. Many instances can be found of reforms in Provincial Councils, and these are adduced and considered.] SECTION XX.

But you say that

> ℭ. From this the Lady called us, and desiring to hear, whether the ℭ. would grant the Roman Church to be the right Church, the ℭ. granted that it was. A C. p. 53.

ℭ. I. One occasion, which moved Tertullian to write his book *de Praescript. adversus Hæreticos*, was, that he saw little or no profit come by disputations.[1] Sure the ground was the same then and now. It was not to deny that disputation is an opening of the understanding, a sifting out of truth: it was not to affirm that any such disquisition is in and of itself unprofitable. If it had, St. Stephen would not have disputed with the Cyrenians, nor St. Paul with the Grecians, first, and then with the Jews and all comers. No sure: it was some abuse in the disputants that frustrated the good of the disputation. And one abuse in the disputants is "a resolution to hold their own, though it be by unworthy means, and disparagement of truth."[2] And so I find it here: for as it is true that this question was asked, so it is altogether false that it was asked in this form, or so answered.[3] There is a great deal of difference, especially as Romanists handle the question of the Church, between *the* Church and *a* Church; and there is some between a *true* Church and a *right* Church,

§ 20. Acts vi. 9. Acts ix. 29. Acts xix. 17.

[1] [Adversus hæreticos Tertullianus], videns disputationibus nihil aut parum profici. [Tertullian seeing that against heretics arguments produced little or no result.]—Pamelius in Summario, [præfixo] lib. [Tertullian. *de praescript. adversus hæretic. Op.*, p. 233. ed. Pamelii, Colon. 1617.]

[2] Debilitari generosam indolem, in istas argutias conjectam. [A noble nature is weakened, when it throws itself into such subtleties.]—Senec. *Epist.* xlviii. [*Op.* III., p. 99. Ed. Leipsic, 1892.]

[3] Here A. C. hath nothing to say but that the Jesuit did not affirm "That the Lady asked this question in this or any other precise form." No? Why, the words preceding are the Jesuit's own. Therefore, if these were not the Lady's words, he wrongs her, not I him.

[CHAPTER VII.]

which is the word you use, but no man else that I know: I am sure not I.

II. For "the Church" may import in our language "the only true Church"; and, perhaps, as some of you seem to make it, "the root and the ground of the Catholic." And this I never did grant of the Roman Church, nor ever mean to do. But "a Church" can imply no more than that it is a member of the whole. And this I never did nor ever will deny, if it fall not absolutely away from Christ. That it is a "true Church," I granted also; but not a "right," as you impose upon me. For *ens* and *verum*, "being" and "true," are convertible one with another; and everything that hath a being is truly that being which it is, in truth of substance. But this word "right" is not so used, but is referred more properly to perfection in conditions: and in this sense everything that hath a true and real being is not, by and by, right in the conditions of it. A man that is most dishonest, and unworthy the name—a very thief, if you will—is a true man in the verity of his essence, as he is a creature endued with reason; for this none can steal from him, nor he from himself, but death: but he is not therefore a right or an upright man. And a Church that is exceeding corrupt, both in manners and doctrine, and so a dishonour to the name, is yet a true Church in the verity of essence; as a Church is a company of men which profess the faith of Christ, and are baptized into His name: but yet it is not therefore a "right" Church, either in doctrine or manners. It may be you meant cunningly to slip in this word "right," that I might at unawares grant it orthodox. But I was not so to be caught; for I know well that orthodox Christians are "keepers of integrity, and followers of right things" (so St. Augustine[4]), of which the Church of Rome at this day is neither. In this sense, then, no "right," that is, no "orthodox" Church at Rome.

III. And yet no news it is, that I granted the Roman Church to be a true Church. For so much very learned Protestants[5] have

[4] Integritatis custodes, et recta sectantes. [Guardians of Truth, and rightly dividing the word of Truth.] —S. Augustin. lib.] *de vera religione*, cap. v. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 751. D.]

[5] ["Notwithstanding, so far as lawfully we may, we have held, and do hold, fellowship with them, (of the Church of Rome,) . . . touching those main parts of Christian truth wherein they constantly persist, we gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Jesus Christ," etc.]—Hooker, *Eccl. Polit.* B. iii. Ch. i. [Sect. 10. *Works*, vol. i. p. 347. Ed. Church and Paget.] —[Ita etiam] falluntur qui ecclesiam esse negant, quia papatus in ea est,

acknowledged before me, and the truth cannot deny it. For that Church which receives the Scripture as a rule of faith, though but as a partial and imperfect rule, and both the sacraments as instrumental causes and seals of grace, though they add more and misuse these, yet cannot but be a true Church in essence. How it is in manners and doctrine, I would you would look to it with a single eye; "for if piety and a peaceable mind be not joined to a good understanding, nothing can be known in these great things."[6] SECTION XX.

IV. Here A. C. tells us, "That the Jesuit doth not say that the Lady asked this question in this or any other precise form of words; but saith, the Jesuit is sure her desire was to know of me, whether I would grant the Roman Church to be the right Church?" And how was the Jesuit sure the Lady desired to hear this from me? Why, A. C. tells us that too: for he adds, "That the Jesuit had particularly spoken with her before, and wished her to insist upon that point." Where you may see, and it is fit the Clergy of England should consider with what cunning adversaries they have to deal, who can find a way to prepare their disciples, and instruct them beforehand upon what points to insist,[7] that so they may with more ease slide that into their hearts and consciences, which should never come there. And A. C. p. 53. A. C. p. 54.

[quam ii qui papatum affirmant Ecclesiam ipsam esse. So also they are wrong who deny that it is a Church, because a Pope is established in it; just as those are who affirm that the papacy is the Church.]—Junius, *de Ecclesia*, lib. [singular.] cap. xvii. [de Ecclesia Romana. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1020. ed. Genev. 1613.]—And Reynolds, *Thes.* v. negat tantum [Romanum ecclesiam] esse Catholicam, vel sanum membrum [Catholicæ. Only denies that the Roman Church is the Catholic Church, or a healthy limb of the Catholic Church].—[Johan. Rainoldi *Sex Theses de SS. et Ecclesia*: *Thes.* v. in tit. p. 123. ed. Lond. 1602.] Nay, the very Separatists grant it: Fr. Johnson, in his treatise called, *A Christian Plea*, printed 1617, p. 123, etc. ["How can we soundly defend and retain the visible baptism received in the Church of Rome . . . if we do not accordingly acknowledge the Church of Rome to be a visible Church and the people of God . . . a visible Church, I say, though miserably corrupted, etc." *A Christian Plea conteyning three Treatises.* I. The first touching the Anabaptists, and others mainteyning some like errors with them, etc. Made by Francis Johnson, Pastour of the auncient English Church now sojourning at Amsterdam in the Lowe Countreyes. (No place.) Printed in the year of our Lord, 1617.]

[6] Si tamen bono ingenio pietas et pax quædam mentis accedat, sine qua de tantis rebus nihil prorsus intelligi potest.—S. Augustin. lib. *de util. cred.* cap. xviii. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 70. D.]

[7] And after A. C. saith again, p. 54, "that the Lady did not ask the question, as if she meant to be satisfied with hearing what I said," so belike they take caution beforehand for that too, that whatever we say, unless we grant what they would have, their proselytes shall not be satisfied with it.

[CHAPTER VII.]

A. C. p. 54.

this once known, I hope they will the better provide against it. But A. C. goes on, and tells us, "That certainly by my answer, the Lady's desire must needs be to hear from me, not whether the Church of Rome were a right Church, etc.; but whether I would grant that there is but one Holy Catholic Church, and whether the Roman Church—that is, not only that which is in the city or diocese of Rome, but all that agreed with it—be not it." About "a Church," and "the Church," I have said enough before,[8] and shall not repeat. Nor is there any need I should; for A. C. would have it "The Church, the one, holy, Catholic Church." But this cannot be granted, take the Roman Church in what sense they please, in city, or diocese, or all that agree with it. Yet, howsoever, before I leave this, I must acquaint the reader with a perfect Jesuitism. In all the primitive times of the Church, a man, or a family, or a national Church, were accounted right and orthodox, as they agreed with the Catholic Church; but the Catholic was never then measured or judged by man, family, or nation. But now, in the Jesuit's new school, the one Holy Catholic Church[9] must be measured by that which is in the city or diocese of Rome, or of them which agreed with it, and not Rome by the Catholic. For so A. C. says expressly, "The Lady would know of me, not whether that were the Catholic Church to which Rome agreed, but whether that were not the

[8] Sect. xx. No. 2. [*ubi sup.* p. 146.]

[9] And though Stapleton, to magnify the Church of Rome, is pleased to say, Apud veteres pro eodem habita fuerit Romana Ecclesia, et catholica ecclesia. [Among the ancients the Roman Church and the Catholic Church were held to be two names for the same thing.] Yet he is so modest as to give this reason of it: [Obtinuit autem apud veteres hic loquendi modus, non quia solius urbis aut diœcesis Romanæ populus ecclesiam catholicam constituit, (est enim particularis et pars catholicæ,) sed] quia ejus communio erat evidenter et certissime cum tota [ecclesia] catholica. [But this way of speaking became general among the ancients, not because the people of the Roman City and Diocese alone made up the Catholic Church, for it is a particular Church and a part of the Catholic Church, but because its communion with the whole Catholic Church was so evident and so sure.]—*Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] 1. [de ecclesia in se,] Q[uæst.] v. A[rt.] 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 594. B. C.] Lo, the communion of the Roman was then with the Catholic Church, not of the Catholic with it. And St. Cyprian employed his legates, Caldonius and Fortunatus, not to bring the Catholic Church to the communion of Rome, but Rome to the Catholic Church, elaborarent, ut ad catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem scissi corporis membra componerent, [et Christianæ caritatis vinculo copularent. They should do their utmost in order to unite to the one Catholic Church the members of the divided body, and to bind them together with the bond of Christian charity.] Now the members of this rent and torn body were they of Rome, then in an open schism between Cornelius and Novatian.—S. Cyprian. lib. ii. *Epist.* 10. [ad Cornelium, Epist. xlii. *Op.*, p. 56. ed. Benedict.]

Holy Catholic Church, which agreed with Rome." So upon the matter, belike the Christian faith was committed to the custody of the Roman, not of the Catholic, Church; and a man cannot agree with the Catholic Church of Christ, in this new doctrine of A. C., unless he agree with the Church of Rome: but if he agree with that, all is safe, and he is as orthodox as he need be. Section XX

V. But A. C. is yet troubled about the form of the Lady's question: and he will not have it, "That she desired to know, whether I would grant the Roman Church to be the right Church?" though these be her words, according to the Jesuit's own setting down; but he thinks the question was, "Whether the Church of Rome was not the right Church?" Not "be not," but "was not." "Was not?" that is, "was not once or in time past the right Church, before Luther and others made a breach from it?" Why truly A. C. needed not have troubled himself half so much about this. For let him take his choice: it shall be all one to me, whether the question were asked by "be," or by "was." For the Church of Rome neither "is" nor "was" the right Church, as the Lady desired to hear. A particular Church it is, and was, and in some times right, and in some times wrong; and then in some things right, and in some things wrong: but "the right Church," or "the Holy Catholic Church," it never was, nor ever can be; and, therefore, was not such before Luther and others either left it, or were thrust from it. A "particular" Church it was; but then A. C. is not distinct enough here neither. For the Church of Rome both was, and was not, a "right" or orthodox Church, before Luther made a breach from it. For the word *ante*, "before," may look upon Rome and that Church a great way off, or long before; and then in the prime times of it, it was a most "right" and orthodox Church. But it may look also nearer home, and upon the immediate times before Luther, or some ages before that; and then in those times Rome was a corrupt and a tainted Church, far from being right.[10] And yet A. C. p. 54.

[10] Cum infiniti abusus, schismata quoque et hæreses, per totum nunc Christianum orbem invalescant, Ecclesiam Dei legitima indigere reformatione nemini non apertum erit. [Since countless abuses, as well as schisms and heresies were present in the whole Christian world, every one must see that the Church of God requires a lawful Reformation.]—Petri de Alliaco, Card. Cameracensis, lib. [tractat.] *de Reformatione Ecclesiæ*, [oblat. in Concil. Constant. an 1415. apud J. Gerson. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 903, et seqq. ed. Dupin. Antw. 1706. The above words do not occur in this Tract as printed in Gerson's work: they are to be found, in an editorial

[CHAPTER VII.] miserable rent in the Church, and I make no question but the best men do most bemoan it;[13] nor is he a Christian, that would not have unity, might he have it with truth. But I never said, nor thought, "that the Protestants made this rent." The cause of the schism is yours: for you thrust us from you, because we called for truth and redress of abuses. For a schism[14] must needs be theirs, whose the cause of it is. The woe runs full out of the mouth of Christ, ever against "him that gives the offence"; not against him that takes it, ever. But you have, by this carriage, given me just cause, never to treat with you, or your like, but before a judge or a jury.

Matt. xviii. 7.

A. C. pp. 55, 56. II. But here A. C. tells me, "I had no cause to be angry, either with the Jesuit or myself. Not with the Jesuit, for he writ down my words in fresh memory, and upon special notice taken of the passage, and that I did say either *iisdem*, or *æquipollentibus verbis*, 'either in these or equivalent words,' That the Protestants did make the rent or division from the Roman Church." What, did the Jesuit set down my words in fresh memory, and upon special notice taken, and were they so few as these, "The Protestants did make the schism"; and yet was his memory so short, that he cannot tell, whether I uttered this *iisdem*, or *æquipollentibus verbis*? Well, I would A. C. and his fellows would leave this art of theirs, and in Conferences, which they are so ready to call for, impose no more upon other men than they utter. And you may observe too, that after all this full assertion, That I spake this *iisdem*, or *æquipollentibus verbis*, A. C. concludes thus: "The Jesuit took special notice in fresh memory, and is sure he related, at least in sense, just as it was uttered." What is this, "at least in sense just as it was uttered?" Do not these two interfere, and

A. C. p. 57.

A. C. p. 55.

[13] Hanc, quæ respectu hominum Ecclesia dicitur, observare, ejusque communionem colere debemus. [We ought to treat this body, which in the regard of men is styled the Church, with respect, and to cultivate communion with it.]—Calvin. *Instit.* [lib. iv.] cap. 1. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 272.]

[14] Recte [igitur] scias nos fecisse, recedendo a vobis. [Know that we acted rightly in leaving you.]—Lucif. [Calaritan.] *libello de non conveniendo cum hæreticis.* [*Max. Bibl. Patrum*, tom. iv. p. 222. E. ed. Lugd. 1677.] He speaks of the Arians, and I shall not compare you with them, nor give any offence that way. I shall only draw the general argument from it, thus: If the orthodox did well in departing from the Arians, then the schism was to be imputed to the Arians; although the orthodox did not depart from them. Otherwise if the orthodox had been guilty of the schism, he could not have said, *recte scias nos fecisse recedendo.* For it cannot be that a man should do well in making a schism. There may be therefore a necessary separation, which yet incurs not the blame of schism; and that is, when doctrines are taught contrary to the Catholic faith.

shew the Jesuit to be upon his shuffling pace? For if it were "just as it was uttered," then it was in the very form of words too, not in "sense" only. And if it were but "at least in sense," then when A. C. hath made the most of it, it was not "just as it was uttered." Besides, "at least in sense," doth not tell us in whose sense it was. For if A. C. mean the Jesuit's sense of it, he may make what sense he pleases of his own words: but he must impose no sense of his upon my words. But as he must leave my words to myself, so when my words are uttered or written, he must leave their sense either to me, or to that genuine construction which an ingenuous reader can make of them. And what my words of grant were, I have before expressed, and their sense too. SECTION XXI.

III. "Not with myself": that is the next. For A. C. says, "It is truth, and that the world knows it, that the Protestants did depart from the Church of Rome, and got the name of Protestants, by protesting against it." No, A. C., by your leave, this is not truth neither; and therefore I had reason to be angry with myself, had I granted it. For, first, the Protestants did not depart: for departure is voluntary, so was not theirs. I say, not theirs, taking their whole body and cause together. For that some among them were peevish, and some ignorantly zealous, is neither to be doubted, nor is there danger in confessing it. Your body is not so perfect, I wot well, but that many amongst you are as pettish, and as ignorantly zealous, as any of ours. You must not suffer for these, nor we for those; nor should the Church of Christ for either. Next, the Protestants did not get that name by protesting against the Church of Rome, but by protesting (and that when nothing else would serve) against her errors and superstitions.[15] Do you but remove them from the Church of Rome, A. C. p. 56.

[15] Conventus ordinum Imperii Spiræ celebratur. In quo decretum factum, ut Edictum Wormatiense observetur contra Novatores, (*sic appellare placuit*), et ut omnia in integrum restituantur, (*et sic nulla omnino reformatio*). Contra hoc Edictum [Elector Johannes et Landgravius et alii] die 16. Aprilis A.D. 1529, solenniter protestantur: hinc ortum pervulgatum illud Protestantium nomen. [A meeting of the Orders of the Empire was held at Spires. Here a decree was made that the Edict of Worms should be observed against the Innovators (so it was decided to call them), and that everything should be restored to its former condition; (and so there would be no Reformation at all). Against this edict the Elector John, etc. made a solemn protest; this was the beginning of the widespread name of Protestants].—Se[thi] Calvisii [opus] [*Chron[ologicum,]* ad An. 1529. [pp. 920, 921. ed. Francof. 1685.] This protestation, therefore, was not simply against the Roman Church, but against the edict, which was for the restoring of all things to their former estate, without any reformation.

[CHAPTER VII.] and our Protestation is ended, and the separation too. Nor is Protestation itself such an unheard of thing in the very heart of religion. For the sacraments both of the Old and New Testaments are called by your own school, "visible signs protesting the faith." Now if the sacraments be *protestantia*, "signs protesting," why may not men also, and without all offence, be called Protestants,[16] since by receiving the true sacraments, and by refusing them which are corrupted, they do but protest the sincerity of their faith against that doctrinal corruption, which hath invaded the great sacrament of the Eucharist, and other parts of religion? Especially, since they are men,[17] which must protest their faith by these visible signs and sacraments.

A. C. p. 56. IV. But A. C. goes on, and will needs have it, that the Protestants were the cause of the schism. "For," saith he, "though the Church of Rome did thrust them from her by excommunication, yet they had first divided themselves by obstinate holding and teaching opinions contrary to the Roman faith and practice of the Church; which to do, St. Bernard[18] thinks is pride, and St. Augustine madness." So then, in his opinion, First, excommunication on their part was not the prime cause of this division; but the "holding and teaching of contrary opinions." Why, but then in my opinion, that "holding and teaching was" not the prime cause neither, but the corruptions and superstitions of Rome, which forced many men to hold and teach the contrary. So the prime cause was theirs still. Secondly, A. C.'s words are very considerable. For he charges the Protestants to be the authors of the schism, for "obstinate holding and teaching contrary opinions." To what, I pray? Why, to the Roman faith.[19] To

[16] [The name was given to the German Party who protested against a decree of the Diet of Spires and the Emperor Charles V. in 1529. The chief points of their Protest were against (1) the Popish Mass, (2) the refusal of the Cup to the Laity, (3) equalling Tradition with Scripture.]

[17] Quibus homo fidem suam protestaretur [de futuro Salvatoris adventu.] [Signs by which a man might protest his faith, in the future coming of a Saviour.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. iii. Q[væst.] lxi. A[rt.] 3. [in respons.]

[18] [Founder of the Abbey of Clairvaux; one of the early Cistercian Monks; reasoned against Abelard; preached a Crusade in 1146; died in 1153.]

[19] I know Bellarmine, [*de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 4. § 3.] quotes St. Jerome: Scito Romanam fidem, etc. [ubi] supra, Sect. iii. No. 9. [p. 11. note 26.] But there St. Jerome doth not call it *Fidem Romanam*, as if *Fides Romana* and *Fides Catholica* were convertible; but he speaks of it in the concrete, *Romana Fides*, i.e. Romanorum Fides, quæ laudata fuit ab Apostolo, etc. Rom. i. 8.—S. Hieron. *Apol. cont. Ruffin.* lib. iii. [*Op.*, tom. iv. par. ii. col. 449. ed. Benedict.] That is, that faith which was then at Rome when St. Paul commended it. But the Apostle's com-

the Roman faith? It was wont to be the Christian faith, to which contrary opinions were so dangerous to the maintainers. But all is Roman now with A. C. and the Jesuit. And then to countenance the business, St. Bernard and St. Augustine are brought in; whereas neither of them speak of the Roman, and St. Bernard perhaps neither of the Catholic nor the Roman, but of a particular, Church or congregation. Or if he speak of the Catholic, of the Roman certainly he doth not. His words are, *Quæ major superbia, etc.* "What greater pride, than that one man should prefer his judgment before the whole congregation of all the Christian churches in the world?" So A. C. as out of St. Bernard. But St. Bernard not so.[20] For these last words, "of all the Christian churches in the world," are not in St. Bernard. And whether *toti congregationi* imply more in that place than a particular Church, is not very manifest. Nay, I think it is plain, that he speaks both of, and to, that particular congregation, to which he was then preaching. And I believe A. C. will not easily find where *tota congregatio*, "the whole congregation," is used in St. Bernard, or any other of the Fathers, for the whole Catholic Church of Christ. And howsoever the meaning of St. Bernard be, it is one thing for a private man, *judicium suum praeferre*, to prefer and so follow his private judgment before the whole congregation, which is indeed *lepra proprii consilii*, as St. Bernard there calls it, "the proud leprosy of the private spirit"; and quite another thing for an intelligent man, and in some things unsatisfied, modestly to propose his doubts even to the Catholic Church. And much more may a whole national Church, nay, the whole body of the Protestants, do it. And for St. Augustine, the place alleged out of him is a known place; and he speaks indeed of the whole Catholic Church; and he says,[21] and he says it truly, "It is a part of most

mending of it in the Romans at one time, passes no deed of assurance that it shall continue worthy of commendations among the Romans through all time.

[20] Quæ major superbia, quam ut unus homo toti congregationi judicium suum praeferat; tanquam ipse solus habeat spiritum Dei? [What pride can be greater than for one man to place his judgment before that of the whole congregation; as if he alone had the Spirit of God. And he quotes *1 Kings* xv. 22.]—S. Bernard. *Serm.* iii. *de Resurrect.* [fol. 35. col. 2. D. ed. Paris. 1551. Migne, ii. 290.]

[21] Similiter etiam, si quid horum tota per orbem frequentat Ecclesia. Nam et hinc quin ita faciendum sit disputare, insolentissimæ insaniæ est. [We ought to act in the same manner also if any of them is a regular practise in the Church throughout the world. For it would be the most utter madness to dispute that in that case it should be done.]—S. Augustin. *Epist.* cxviii. cap. 5. [*Epist.* liv. seu, ad inquisitiones Januarii, lib. i. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 126. B. Migne, ii. 202.]

CHAPTER VII.] insolent madness for any man to dispute, whether that be to be done, which is usually done in, and through, the whole Catholic Church of Christ." Where, first, here is not a word of the Roman Church, but of that which is *tota per orbem*, "all over the world,"
A. C. p. 56. Catholic, which Rome never yet was. Secondly, A. C. applies this to the Roman faith, whereas St. Augustine speaks there expressly of the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and particularly about the manner of offering upon Maundy-Thursday,[22] whether it be in the morning, or after supper, or both. Thirdly, it is manifest by the words themselves, that St. Augustine speaks of no matter of faith there, Roman nor Catholic. For *frequentat*, and *faciendum*, are for "things done, and to be done,"[23] not for things believed, or to be believed. So here is not one word for the Roman faith in either of these places. And after this, I hope you will the less wonder at A. C.'s boldness. Lastly, a right sober man may, without the least touch of insolency or madness, dispute a business of religion with the Roman either Church or prelate (as all men know Irenæus did with Victor[24]), so it be with modesty, and for the finding out or confirming of truth, free from vanity and purposed opposition against even a particular church. But in any other way to dispute the whole Catholic Church, is just that which St. Augustine calls it, "insolent madness."

V. But now were it so, that the Church of Rome were orthodox in all things, yet the faith, by the Jesuit's leave, is not simply to be called the Roman, but the Christian and the
A C p 56. Catholic faith. And yet A. C. will not understand this; but Roman and Catholic, whether Church or faith, must be one and

[22] Quæris quid per quintam feriam ultimæ hebdomadis Quadragesimæ fieri debeat, an offerendum sit mane? etc. [Do you ask what should be done through the fifth day of the last week in Lent; whether the offering (Holy Communion) should be made in the morning?]—S. Augustin. *ibid.*

[23] And so Bellarmine most expressly. But then he adds, Ecclesia universa non solum non potest errare in credendo, sed nec in operando, ac praesertim in ritu et cultu divino. [The universal Church not only cannot err in what it believes, but also not in what it does, and especially in its ritual and divine worship.]—[Bellarmin.] *de verbo Dei*, lib. iv. cap. 9. § 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 193. B.] And if this be true, what is it to Rome?

[24] Euseb. [*Eccl. Hist.*] lib. v. cap. 24. [*apud Hist. Eccl. Script.* tom. i. p. 245, ed. Reading.] Et, [Ἕως ὁ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπος Βίκτωρ, ἄμετρα θερμανθεὶς, ἀκοινωνησίαν τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατίταις ἀπέστειλεν· ἐφ' ᾧ γενομένῳ Εἰρηναῖος . . . τοῦ Βίκτορος δι' ἐπιστολῆς γενναίως κατέδραμεν, μεμψάμενος μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν θερμότητα, κ.τ.λ. Until Victor the Bishop of Rome became incontrollably angry, and excommunicated Quartodecimans in Asia; but when this happened Irenæus warmly opposed Victor in a letter, and blamed his anger.]—Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v. cap. 22. [*ibid.* tom. ii. p. 292.]

the same with him; and therefore infers, "that there can be no just cause to make a schism or division from the whole Church: for the whole Church cannot universally err in doctrine of faith." That the "whole Church" cannot "universally" err in the doctrine of faith, is most true; and it is granted by divers Protestants:[25] so

[25] Quæstio est, an Ecclesia totalis totaliter considerata, *i.e.* pro omnibus simul electis, dum sunt membra militantis Ecclesiæ, possint errare, vel in tota fide, vel in gravi aliquo fidei puncto? Et respondemus simpliciter, id esse impossibile. [The question is whether the whole Church, looked upon as a whole, *i.e.* with regard to all the elect together, so long as they are members of the Church militant, can err, either about the whole faith, or in some important point of faith. And we make the plain answer, that is impossible.]—[Barthol.] Keckerm[an.] *Syst. Theol.* p. 387. edit. Hannoviæ, An. 1602.—Calvinus et cæteri hæretici id concedunt: sed dicunt, intelligi debere de Ecclesia invisibili. [Calvin and the rest of the heretics grant this; but add that it must be understood of the invisible Church.]—Bellarmin. *de Eccl. milit.* lib. iii. cap. 13. § 1. [*Op.* tom. ii. col. 145. D.] But this exception of Bellarmine's, that the Protestants, whom, out of his liberality, he calls heretics, speak of the invisible Church, is merely frivolous. For the Church of the elect is in the Church of them that are called, and the invisible Church in the visible. Therefore, if the whole Church of the elect cannot err in fundamentals, the whole visible Church, in which the same elect are, cannot err. Now that the invisible Church of the elect is in the visible, is manifest out of St. Augustine: Ipsa est Ecclesia quæ intra sagenam Dominicam cum malis piscibus natat. [It is the Church herself which does really swim within the net of the Lord together with the bad fish.]—S. Augustin. *Epist.* xlviii. [xciii. cap. 9. ad Vincentium Rogatistam, *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 245. D. Migne, ii. 338.]—Grana inter illam paleam, quando area, cum videretur, tota palea putabatur. [There are grains mingled with that chaff, though the thrashing-floor, looked at as a whole, appeared to be all chaff.]—S. Augustin. [*Enarr.*] in *Psalmum* cxxi. [4. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1390. A.] And this is proved at large by Hooker, ["And as those everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness, belong to the mystical Church; even so on the other hand, when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company. And this visible Church in like sort is but one," etc.—Hooker,] *Eccl. Polit.* Book iii. ch. 1. [3. *Works*, vol. i. p. 339. Ed. Church and Paget.] For else the elect or invisible Church is tied to no duty of Christianity. For all such duties are required of the Church, as it is visible, and performed in the Church, as it is visible. And Dr. Field speaks as plainly: "[As therefore] we hold it impossible the Church should ever by apostasy and misbelief wholly depart from God, [in proving whereof, Bellarmine (*de Eccl. mil.* lib. iii. cap. 13.) confesseth his fellows have taken much needless pains, seeing no man of our profession thinketh any such thing;] so we hold that it never falleth into any heresy. So that he is as much to be blamed for idle and needless busying himself in proving, That the visible Church never falleth into heresy, which we most willingly grant."—Field, *of the Church*, Book iv. chap. 2. [p. 345. ed. Oxford. 1635; p. 396. ed. Cambridge. 1849.]—"Touching the Church, as it comprehendeth only the believers that now are, [and presently live in the world, it is most certain] and [agreed upon, that] in things necessary to be known [and believed] expressly [and distinctly, it never is ignorant, much less doth err.]"—[Field.] *ibid.*—And Bellarmine himself adds; Calvinus dicit istam propositionem, *Ecclesia non potest errare*, esse veram, si intelligatur cum duplici restrictione. Prima est, si non proponat dogmata extra Scripturam, etc. [Calvin admits the statement to be true that the

[CHAPTER VII.]

you will but understand its not erring in absolute fundamental doctrines. And therefore it is true also, that there can be no just cause to make a schism from the whole Church. But here is the Jesuit's cunning. The whole Church, with him, is the Roman, and those parts of Christendom which subject themselves to the Roman bishop. All other parts of Christendom are in heresy and schism, and what A. C. pleases. Nay, soft! For another Church may separate from Rome, if Rome will separate from Christ. And so far as it separates from Him and the faith, so far may another Church sever from it. And this is all that the learned Protestants do or can say: and I am sure all that ever the Church of England hath either said or done. And that the whole Church cannot err in doctrines absolutely fundamental and necessary to all men's salvation,—besides the authority of these Protestants, most of them being of prime rank,—seems to me to be clear by the promise of Christ, "That the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Whereas most certain it is, that the gates of hell prevail very far against it, if the whole militant Church, universally taken, can err from, or in the foundation; but then this power of not erring is not to be conceived as if it were in the Church, *primo et per se*, "originally or by any power it hath of itself": for the Church is constituted of men, and *humanum est errare*, "all men can err." But this power is in it, partly by the virtue of this promise of Christ: and partly by the matter which it teacheth, which is the unerring word of God, so plainly and manifestly delivered to her, as that it is not possible she should universally fall from it, or teach against it in things absolutely necessary to salvation. Besides, it would be well weighed, whether to believe or teach otherwise, will not impeach the article of the Creed concerning the "Holy Catholic Church," which we profess we believe.

Matt. xvi. 18.

Church cannot err so long as it is understood with two restrictions. The first is, if the Church does not lay down dogmas outside Scripture.]—(And indeed Calvin doth say so, lib. iv. cap. 8. § 13.) Secunda [restrictio] est, si intelligatur de sola Ecclesia universali, non autem [extendatur ad episcopos, qui sunt Ecclesia] repræsentative, [ut nostri loquuntur.] [The second restriction is, if the term Church is understood of the universal Church only; and is not extended to the Bishops by themselves who form the Church in representation, to use the common phrase of our adherents.]—Bellarmin. *de Eccl. milit.* lib. iii. cap. 14. § 2, 3. [*O.*, tom. ii. col. 148. Cp.] And I hope it is as good, and a better, restriction in Calvin, to say the Catholic Church cannot err, if it keep to the Scripture; than for Bellarmine to say, The particular Church of Rome cannot err, because of the Pope's residing there; or the Pope cannot err, if he keep his chair; which yet he affirms. —*De Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 4. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 812. A. *ubi sup.* p. 6. note 7.]

SECTION XXI.

For the Holy Catholic Church, there spoken of, contains not only the whole militant Church on earth, but the whole triumphant also in heaven. For so St. Augustine[26] hath long since taught me. Now if the whole Catholic Church in this large extent be holy, then certainly the whole militant Church is holy, as well as the triumphant, though in a far lower degree; inasmuch as all sanctification, all holiness, is imperfect in this life,[27] as well in churches as in men. Holy then the whole militant Church is. For that which the Apostle speaks of Abraham, is true of the Church, which is a body collective made up of the spiritual seed of Abraham: "If the root be holy, so are branches." Well, then the whole militant Church is holy; and so we believe. Why, but will it not follow then, that the whole militant Church cannot possibly err in the foundations of the faith? That she may err in superstructures and deductions, and other by and unnecessary truths, if her curiosity or other weakness carry her beyond, or cause her to fall short, of her rule, no doubt need be made. But if she can err either from the foundation, or in it, she can be no longer holy, and that article of the Creed is gone. For if she can err quite from the foundation, then she is nor Holy, nor Church, but becomes an infidel. Now this cannot be: for all divines, ancient and modern, Romanists and Reformers, agree in this, That the whole militant Church of Christ cannot fall away into general apostasy.[28] And if she err in the foundation, that is, in

Rom. xi. 16.

[26] Ecclesia tota hic accipienda est, solum ex parte qua peregrinatur in non terris, verum etiam ex illa parte quæ in cœlis. [The whole Church must be included in this term, not only the part which sojourns on earth, but also that part which is in heaven.]—S. Augustin. *Enchiridion*, cap. lvi. [*Op.*, tom. vi. col. 217. D.]

[27] Nemo ex toto sanctus [poterit inveniri.—No one perfectly holy, can be found.]—S. Optat. [Milevit *de. schism. Donatist.*] *contre Parmen.* lib. vii. [cap. 2. *Op.*, p. 103. ed. Dupin.]

[28] Dum Christus orat in excelso, navicula, id est Ecclesia, turbatur, fluctibus in profundo. Sed quia Christus orat, non potest mergi. [Even while Christ is praying in heaven, the ship, *i.e.* the Church, is tossed upon the deep by the waves. . . . But since Christ is praying, it cannot sink.] —[Pseudo-] S. Augustin. *Serm. de verbis Domini*, xiv. cap. 2. [Eracl. Presbyt. *Serm. in Appendic. ad. S. Augustin. Sermones*: Serm. lxxii. de verbis Evang. Matth. xiv. 24. *apud Op.*, S. Augustin. tom. v. app. col. 132. B. Migne, v. 1884.]—Et Bellarmin. *de Eccl. milit.* lib. iii. cap. 13. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 145. D. *ubi sup.* p. 157. note 25.]—Præsidio Christi fulciri Ecclesiæ perpetuitatem: ut inter turbulentas agitationes, et formidabiles motus, salva tamen maneat. [By the protection of Christ the Church is unceasingly supported; so that she still remains safe amid the shocks of the earthquakes and the fearful movements.]—Calvin. *Institut.* lib. ii. cap. cap. 15. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 127.] —[Denique] ipsa Symboli dispositione admonemur perpetuam residere in Ecclesia Christi [delictorum gratiam: quod Ecclesiæ velut constitutæ] remissio peccatorum [adhuc subjungitur. Indeed the very order of the Creed reminds us that the pardon of

[CHAPTER VII.] some one or more fundamental points of faith, then she may be a church of Christ still, but not holy, but becomes heretical; and most certain it is that no assembly, be it never so general, of such heretics, is, or can be, holy.[29] Other errors, that are of a meaner alloy, take not holiness from the Church; but these, that are dyed in grain, cannot consist with holiness, of which faith in Christ is the very foundation. And therefore, if we will keep up our creed, the whole militant Church must be still holy. For if it be not so still, then there may be a time, that *falsum* may *subesse fidei Catholicæ*, "that falsehood," and that in a high degree, in the very article, "may be the subject of the Catholic faith"; which were no less than blasphemy to affirm: for we must still believe the "Holy Catholic Church." And if she be not still holy, then at that time when she is not so, we believe a falsehood under the article of the Catholic Faith. Therefore a very dangerous thing it is to cry out in general terms, that the whole Catholic militant Church can err, and not limit nor distinguish in time: that it can err indeed, for ignorance it hath, and ignorance can err; but err it cannot, either by falling totally from the foundation, or by heretical error in it. For the holiness of the Church consists as much, if not more, in the verity of the faith, as in the integrity of manners taught and commanded in the doctrine of faith.

A. C. p. 56 VI. Now in this discourse, A. C. thinks he hath met with me: for he tells me, "that I may not only safely grant, that Protestants made the division that is now in the Church, but further also; and that with a safe confidence, as one did,—was it not you?" saith he,—"That it was ill done of those who first made the separation." Truly I do not now remember whether I said it or no. But, because A. C. shall have full satisfaction from me, and without any tergiversation, if I did not say it then, I do say it now, and most true it is, That it was ill done of those, whoever they

faults belongs to the Church, because to the Church, as constituted, the forgiveness of sins is annexed.]—Calvin. *Institut.* lib. iv. cap. 1. § 27. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 277.] Now remission of sins cannot be perpetual in the Church, if the Church itself be not perpetual. But the Church itself cannot be perpetual, if it fall away.

[29] [*Et non est Spiritus in eis.* Notandum quod et in isto capitulo, ventus et spiritus, uno apud Hebræos nomine appellatur רוח.] Spiritum [autem] sanctificationis [vocat, qui] in hæreticorum mentibus non potest inveniri. [And "the Spirit is not in them." Notice that in this Chapter, wind and spirit are spoken of in one Hebrew term. And he calls it the Spirit of Sanctification which cannot be found in the minds of heretics.]—S. Hieron. [lib. ii. *Comment.*] *in Jerem. Proph.* [cap.] x. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 579.]

were, that first made the separation. But then A. C. must not understand me of actual only, but of causal, separation. For, as I said before,[30] the schism is theirs, whose the cause of it is. And he makes the separation, that gives the first just cause of it; not he, that makes an actual separation upon a just cause preceding. And this is so evident a truth, that A. C. cannot deny it; for he says, it is "most true." Neither can he deny it in this sense, in which I have expressed it; for his very assertion against us, though false, is in these terms, That we gave the first cause. Therefore he must mean it of causal, not of actual, separation only.

Section XXI.

A. C. p. 56.

VII. But then, A. C. goes on and tells us, "that after this breach was made, yet the Church of Rome was so kind and careful to seek the Protestants, that she invited them publicly with safe conduct to Rome, to a General Council, freely to speak what they could for themselves."[31] Indeed I think the Church of Rome did carefully seek the Protestants; but I doubt it was to bring them within their net. And she invited them to Rome:—a very safe place, if you mark it, for them to come to, just as the lion in the apologue[32] invited the fox to his own den. Yea, but there was "safe conduct" offered too? Yes, "conduct" perhaps, but not "safe"; or safe perhaps for going thither, but none for coming thence. *Vestigia nulla retrorsum.* Yea, but it should have been to a "General Council"? Perhaps so: but was the "conduct safe," that was given for coming to a Council, which they call General, to some others before them? No sure: John Huss, and Jerome of Prague,[33] burnt for all their safe conduct. And so long as the Jesuits[34] write and maintain, "that faith given

A. C. p. 57.

[30] Sect. xxi. No. 1. [*ubi sup.* p. 152.]

[31] [The German Protestants always maintained that they dared not go to a Council south of the Alps, and they quoted the cases of John Huss and Jerome of Prague burnt in spite of the safe conduct given them by the Emperor Sigismund at the Council of Constance, 1415.]

[32] Olim quod vulpes ægroto cauta *Leoni*
Respondit, referam: Quia me vestigia terrent
Omnia te adversum spectantia, nulla retrorsum.
Horat. *Epist.* i. 1. [73.] ex Æsopo.
[I will make you the answer which of old the prudent fox made to the sick lion. I am frightened as I see that all the footmarks travel towards you, none come back from you.]

[33] Though I cannot justify all, which these two men said, yet, safe conduct being given, that public faith ought not to have been violated.

[34] [Iis positis, quæstio est, An quando Catholicus princeps, sive sæcularis sit, sive ecclesiasticus, concedit hæreticis salvum conductum libere veniendi et redeundi, sive id faciat jure communi sive speciali, debeat illi servari fidem, necne:] Affirmant uno consensu omnes Catho-

[CHAPTER VII.

is not to be kept with heretics"; and the Church of Rome leaves this lewd doctrine uncensured, as it hath hitherto done, and no exception put in of force and violence; A. C. shall pardon us that

lici. [These principles being laid down, the problem is this, When a Catholic prince, lay or spiritual, has given heretics a safe conduct promising them freedom to come and to go, either by common or special law, ought he to keep faith or no; all Catholics answer 'yes' with one consent.]—Becanus, *disput. theology. de fide hæreticis servanda*, cap. xii. § 5. [*apud Op.*, tom. ii. opuscul. theologic. tom. ii. p. 17. F. ed. Paris. 1633.] But for all this brag of (Affirmant uno consensu omnes Catholici), Becanus shuffles pitifully, to defend the Council of Constance. For thus he argues: Aiunt Joanni Hussio fidem violatam esse. Nego. A quo violata est? an a patribus Concilii Constantiensis? At patres fidem illi non dederunt. An ab Imperatore Sigismundo? Is dedit quidem, sed non violavit. Imo, nec Patres. [It is said that faith was broken with John Huss. I deny it. Who broke faith with him? Was it the Fathers of the Council of Constance? Those Fathers never pledged their faith. Was it the Emperor Sigismund? He certainly pledged his faith, but he did not break it. And I add, neither did the Fathers break it.—*Ibid.* cap. xii. [§ 7. p. 17. D.] But all men know that the Emperor was used by the Fathers at Constance to bring Huss thither. Sigismundus Hussum Constantiam vocat, et missis literis publica fide cavet, mense Octob. Ann. 1414, etc. Edit. in 16°. [Sigismund summons Huss to Constance, and in his letters pledges the faith of the Government.]—Et etiamsi primo graviter tulit Hussi incarcerationem, tamen cum diceret fidem hæreticis non esse servandam, non modo remisit offensionem, sed et primus acerbe in eum pronunciavit. [And although at first he was annoyed at Huss' imprisonment, after it had been explained to him that no faith should be kept with heretics, he not only subdued his anger, but was even the first to pronounce bitterly against him.]—*Ibid.* This is a mockery. And Becanus's argument is easily returned upon himself. For if the Fathers did it in cunning, that the Emperor should give safe conduct, which themselves meant not to keep, then they broke faith; and if the Emperor knew they would not keep it, then he himself broke faith, in giving a safe conduct which he knew to be invalid. And as easy it is to answer what Becanus adds to save that Council's act, could I stay upon it. Fides hæreticis data servanda non est, sicut nec tyrannis, piratis, et cæteris publicis prædonibus, etc. [Faith pledged to heretics ought not to be kept, any more than faith pledged to tyrants, pirates, and any other public plunderer.]—Simancas, [Pacensis Episcop. de Catholic.] *Instit.* [*ib.*] Tit. xlvi. § 52. [p. 365. ed. Romæ, 1575.] And although Becanus in the place above cited (§ 13.) confidently denies, that the Fathers at Constance decreed, No faith to be kept with heretics: and cites the words of the Council (Sess. xix.); yet there the very words themselves have it thus: Posse eos punire Concilium, etc., etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii, [alias non venturi. A Council may punish them, . . . though they came to the place of trial, relying on the safe conduct, . . . and without it would not have come.]—Apud Becanum, *ibid.* cap. xiii. p. 18. C.]—And much more plainly Simancas, *Inst.* Tit. xlvi. § 52. [*ibid.* p. 366.] Jure igitur hæretici quidam gravissimo Concilii Constantiensis judicio legitima flamma concremati sunt, quamvis promissa illis securitas fuisset. [It was quite just and right then that the most reverend decree of the Council of Constance had certain heretics lawfully burnt by fire; although a safe conduct had been given them.]—So they are not only Protestants, which charge the Council of Constance with this. Nor can Becanus say as he doth, Affirmant uno consensu omnes Catholici fidem hæreticis servandam esse; for Simancas denies it. And he quotes others [Jacob. Menochius, Salomonius, Thom. Aquin.] for it, which A. C. would be loth should not be accounted Catholics. But how faithfully Simancas says the one, or Becanus the

we come not to Rome, nor within the reach of Roman power, what freedom of speech soever be promised us. For to what end freedom of speech on their part, since they are resolved to alter

other, let them take it between them and the reader be judge. In the mean time, the very Canon of the Council of Constance (Sess. xix.) is this: Quod non obstantibus salvis conductibus imperatoris, regum, etc. possit per judicem competentem de hæretica pravitate inquiri. [That in spite of safe conducts from the emperor and kings, etc., a competent judge may conduct a trial on a charge of heretical wickedness.]—[In this note a reference for the facts, first, of John Huss coming to the Council of Constance at Sigismund's request; and, secondly, of Sigismund's dissatisfaction with the violation of the safe-conduct by Huss's imprisonment, is made to an authority "Edit. in 16°." So it stands in Laud's own edition of the Conference, 1639. In the editions of 1673 and 1686 the reading is "Edit. in 16." which is adopted by the Clarendon Press edition of 1839. It is plain that the name of the authority has been accidentally omitted. Thorold the Jesuit (T. C.) in his answer to Laud's Conference, "*Laud's Labyrinth*," p. 157, observes, "But 'all men know,' says he (Laud) 'that the Emperor, etc.' which he pretends to prove by a Latin authority of I know not whom; for he cites only 'Edit. in 16.' and afterwards *Ibid.*, leaving us to guess who his author should be: but we will show his Lordship all the respect we can, and suppose he meant to cite some author of credit. What doth he say," etc. Stillingfleet, in his reply to Thorold and vindication of Laud, "*Historical Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion*," does not supply the reference defective in Laud. The present Editor has not been able to recover the exact words; but the following passages from writers on either side of the dispute, abundantly confirm the facts which Laud has left upon anonymous authority. Hussius damnatur fremente licet Sigismundo. (Huss was condemned in spite of Sigismund's complaint.)—Whittaker. *Respons. ad rationem* IV. Campiani. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 20. col. 2.—Sigismundus misit nobiles Bohemos conciliarios suos, ad Joannem Huss, qui ei persuaderent ut sub fide publica . . . ad Constantiam veniret. (Sigismund sent to John Huss his councillors, who were Bohemian nobles, in order that they should persuade him to come to Constance relying on the pledged faith of the Government.)—D. Joannis Molani Sacræ Theolog. Lovan. Professor. *de fide Hæreticis servanda*, libri III. lib. ii. cap. 1. p. 63. ed. Colon. 1584.—Cum autem eo venisset aberat Sigismundus, et mox a concilio est arrestatus (sc. Joan. Huss.) . . . Tum rex libenter eum, propter salvum conductum a se datum, captivitate liberasset. Sed a doctis responsum accepit, nullo modo deberi salvum conductum hæretico pertinaci. Ex quo agnoscens fidem a se datam, ex juris dispositione, eo se non extendere, non solum destitit, sed præterea . . . Joannem Huss degradatum ad se recepit. (But when he came there, Sigismund was away, and he was promptly arrested by the Council. Then the king wished to set him free, because he had from him a safe conduct. But the learned men answered that a safe conduct, when given to a contumacious heretic, was not binding. And recognising that the pledge which he had given, according to law, did not go so far as to protect his contumaciousness he not only gave up his purpose; but further had John Huss degraded before him.) —*Ibid.* cap. iii. p. 71.—Rex Sigismundus patriæ misertus, et cleri catholici in Bohemia, per fratrem Wenceslaum effecit, ut Joannes Hus sub salvo conductu et fide publica ipsius Sigismundi regis Constantiam in concilium mitteretur . . . . Quem (Hussum sc.) apparitores Papæ et Cardinalium comprehendentes . . . in palatium deduxerunt. Quem rex Romanorum libenter propter salvum conductum liberasset, nisi a doctis accepisset responsum, Nullo jure deberi salvum conductum hæretico in sua hæresi persistenti. (King Sigismund in pity for his country and for the Catholic Clergy of Bohemia, contrived by the help of his brother Wenceslaus, that John Huss should be sent under

[CHAPTER VII.]

nothing?[35] And to what end freedom of speech on our part, if, after speech hath been free, life shall not?

A. C. p. 57.

VIII. And yet for all this, A. C. "makes no doubt, but that the Roman Church is so far from being cause of the continuance of the schism, or hindrance of the re-union, that it would yet give a free hearing with most ample safe conduct, if any hope might be given that the Protestants would sincerely seek nothing but truth and peace." Truly A. C. is very resolute for the Roman Church, yet how far he may undertake for it, I cannot tell. But for my part, I am of the same opinion for the "continuing of the schism," that I was for the making of it; that is, that it is ill, very ill done of those, whoever they be, Papists or Protestants, that give just cause to continue a separation. But for free hearings or safe conducts, I have said enough, till that Church do not only say, but do, otherwise. And as for truth and peace, they are in every man's mouth, with you and with us; but lay they but half so close to the hearts of men, as they are common on their tongues, it would soon be better with Christendom than at this day it is, or is like to be. And for the Protestants in general, I hope they seek both truth and peace sincerely. The Church of England, I am sure, doth, and hath taught me to pray for both;[36] as I most heartily do. But what Rome doth in this, if the world will not see, I will not censure.

safe conduct and on the public promise of himself, Sigismund, the King, to Constance to the Council. . . . He was there seized by the officers of the Popes and Cardinals . . . and conveyed to the palace. The king of the Romans would have liked to set him free because of the safe conduct; but gave way when the learned men gave him this reply, that no law allowed the benefit of a safe conduct to a heretic persisting in his heresy.) — *Cochlæi Histor. Hussitarum*, lib. ii. pp. 70, 74. ed. apud S. Victorem prope Moguntiam, 1549. The last citation in Cochlæus is from a work on the Council of Constance, written in German, by an eye-witness, Ulric Reichenthal. Note by Dr. Scott.]

[35] For so much A. C. confesses, p. 45. For if they should give way to the altering of one, then why not of another, and another, and so of all? And the Trent Fathers, in a great point of doctrine being amazed, and not knowing what to answer to a Bishop of their own, yet were resolved not to part with their common error. Certum tamen erat doctrinam eam non probare, sed quam antea didicissent, firmiter tenere, esse necessariam. [It was certain that they did not agree with that doctrine, but held firmly to it, because they had previously learnt it.]—P. Sarpi. *Hist. Concil. Trident.* lib. ii. p. 227. ed. Leyd. 1622. [p. 192. ed. August. Trinobant. 1620.]

[36] "Beseeching God to inspire continually the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord."—["Have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, etc. So fetch them home, blessed Lord, to Thy flock, that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one flock under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord," etc.] In the prayer for the militant Church; and in the third collect on Good-Friday.

IX. And for that, which A. C. adds, "that such a free hearing is more than ever the English Catholics could obtain, though they have often offered and desired it, and that but under the prince's word; and that no answer hath, nor no good answer can be given":—and he cites Campian for it—how far, or how often this hath been asked by the English Romanists, I cannot tell, nor what answer hath been given them. But surely Campian[37] was too bold, and so is A. C. too, to say, *Honestum responsum nullum*, "no good answer" can be given.[38] For this, I think, is a very good answer, That the Kings and the Church of England had no reason to admit of a public dispute with the English Romish clergy, till they shall be able to show it, under the seal or powers of Rome, that that Church will submit to a third, who may be an indifferent judge between us and them, or to such a General Council as is after mentioned.[39] And this is an honest, and I think, a full answer. And without this all disputation must end in clamour; and therefore the more public, the worse: because as the clamour is the greater, so perhaps will be the schism too. SECTION XXI. A. C. p. 57.

ℭ. Moreover he said, he would ingenuously acknowledge, that the corruption of manners in the Romish Church was not a sufficient cause to justify their departing from it. [A. C. p. 55.]

ℜ. I would I could say you did as ingenuously repeat as I did confess. For I never said that corruption of manners was, or was not, a sufficient cause to justify their departure. How could I say this, since I did not grant that they did depart, otherwise than is before expressed?[40] There is difference between departure and causeless thrusting from you; for out of the Church is not in your power (God be thanked) to thrust us: think on that. And so much I said expressly then. That which I did ingenuously § 22.

[37] [A Jesuit Preacher sent over on a mission to prevent English Romanists from conforming, in 1581, under Queen Elizabeth. He was captured and executed for treason in the next year, by order of the Government.]

[38] [Anno præterito . . . interiorem in Angliam ubi penetrassem, nihil vidi familiarius, quam inusitata supplicia; nihil certius quam incerta pericula. [When I succeeded in getting into England in the past year I saw nothing more often than punishments previously unknown, nothing more certain than the uncertainty when danger would fall upon me, etc. This is Campian's complaint of the treatment of Romanists in England in 1580, under Queen Elizabeth.]—[Edmund.] Campian. [doctissimis academicis Oxon. et Cantabrig. in] præf. præfix. [*Decem*] *Rationibus propositis in causa fidei*: apud Opuscul., pp. 12, 13. ed. Antverp. 1631.]

[39] Sect. xxvi. No. 1.

[40] Sect. xxi. No. 6. [*ubi sup.* p. 161.]

[CHAPTER VII.]

confess, was this: "That corruption in manners only is no sufficient cause to make a separation in the Church"[41]: nor is it. It is a truth agreed on by the Fathers, and received by divines of all sorts, save by the Cathari,[42] to whom the Donatist[43] and the Anabaptist[44] after accorded: and against whom Calvin disputes it strongly.[45] And St. Augustine is plain: "There are bad fish in the net of the Lord, from which there must be ever a separation in heart and in manners; but a corporal separation must be expected at the sea-shore, that is, the end of the world."[46] And the best fish that are, must not tear and break the net, because the bad are with them. And this is as ingenuously confessed for you, as by me. For if corruption in manners were a just cause of actual separation of one church from another, in that catholic body of Christ, the Church of Rome hath given as great cause as any; since, as Stapleton grants, "there is scarce any sin that can be thought by man, heresy only excepted, with which that see hath not been foully stained, especially from eight hundred years after Christ."[47] And he need not except heresy, into which Biel grants

[41] Modo ea, quæ ad cathedram pertinent, recta praecipiant. [Only let them teach those doctrines rightly which belong to the category of decided dogmas.] — S. Hier. *Ep.* 236. [?]

[42] [Originally a sect of Manichæans, who called themselves Cathari or Pure. They were found all over Europe as late as the 12th century.]

[43] [The Donatists were an African sect, making schism in 312 A.D., who refused to acknowledge baptism by heretics as valid.]

[44] [The Anabaptist sect first appeared in Germany in 1521, and preached that the Church should be composed only of holy persons. The early members tried to overthrow violently the whole organisation of society under Thomas Munzer, and were crushed down by force with great massacres. The sect gradually became peaceable; several were burnt in England in 1535, and executions of them for rebaptising their members took place till 1575. Even after this they were often imprisoned and ill-used. They became very powerful during the Great Rebellion, under the lead of Major-General Harrison. At this time Laud was watching them with anxiety and suspicion, and several were imprisoned.]

[45] [Calvin.] *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. i. § 13. etc. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 274.]

[46] [S. Augustin.] *Epist.* xlviii. [xciii. etc. *ubi sup.* p. 157. note 25. Migne, ii. 338.] A malis piscibus corde semper et moribus separantur, etc. Corporalem [autem] separationem in littore maris, hoc est, in fine sæculi [Ecclesia] expectat. [In heart and mind they are always separated from the bad fish. The separation of bodies the Church must wait for—to be accomplished on the sea-shore, *i.e.* the end of the world.]

[47] [Decimo, ad reliquas omnes vexationes accesserunt enormia et horrenda Rom. pontificum peccata atque flagitia.] Vix [enim] ullum peccatum, sola hæresi excepta, cogitari potest, quo illa sedes turpiter maculata non fuerit, maxime ab anno 800 [et infra. Et tamen contra tot persecutiones externas et internas, sibi quasi succedentes, post tot hæreses, tot schismata, tot domesticas calamitates, tot et tanta Romanæ curiæ peccata . . . manet et stat Romana sedes, etc. Tenthly, we must add to all the other troubles, the hideous and horrible sins and crimes of the Roman Popes. For scarcely any sin, with the single exception of heresy, can be thought of with which that See has not been

it possible the bishops of that see may fall.[48] And Stella[49] and Almaine grant it freely, that some of them did fall, and so ceased to be heads of the Church, and left Christ, God be thanked, at that time of His vicar's defection, to look to His cure Himself. SECTION XXII.

¶. But, saith he, besides corruption of manners, there were also errors in doctrine . . . [A. C. p. 55.]

§. This I spake indeed. And can you prove that I spake not true in this? But I added, though here again you are pleased to omit it, "that some of the errors of the Roman Church were dangerous to salvation." For it is not every light error in disputable doctrine and points of curious speculation, that can be a just cause of separation in that admirable body of Christ, which is His Church, or of one member of it from another. For He gave His natural body to be rent and torn upon the cross, that His mystical body might be one. And St. Augustine infers upon it, "that he is no way partaker of divine charity, that is an enemy to this unity."[50] Now, what errors in doctrine may give just cause of § 23. Eph. i. 23.

foully stained, especially from the year 800 onwards. And still, against all those persecutions within and without, coming quickly one after the other, after all those heresies, those schisms, those misfortunes at home, those countless hideous sins of the Roman Court . . . the See of Rome remains and stands firm.—Stapleton.] *Relect. Controv.* Controv. I. [de Ecclesia in se.] Quæst. v. Art. 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 597. D.]

[48] Gabr. Biel. *Canon. Miss.* [*Expos.*] Lect. xxiii. [fol. xxxii. col. 4. ed. Johan. Cleyn. Lugd. 1514.]

[49] [Hoc enim verbum, (sc. Ego rogavi pro te, etc.) non dixit Christus Petro tanquam privatæ personæ, quia Petrus peccavit post hæc verba, et fides in eo defecit, et multi pontifices Romani erraverunt; sicut Marcellinus, qui idolis sacrificavit, et Liberius papa, qui Arianis consensit, et Anastasius quoque secundus propter hæresis crimen repudiatus fuit ab ecclesia, et alii etiam plurimi contra catholicam fidem tenuerunt, ut Johannes vigesimus secundus, etc. For this sentence (I have prayed for thee) Christ did not utter to Peter as a private person, for Peter did sin after those words were spoken, and his faith did fail, and many Roman Popes have erred, as Marcellinus who offered sacrifice to idols, and Pope Liberius, who agreed with the Arians; and Anastasius the Second was expelled from the Church on a charge of heresy: and a great number more held doctrine contrary to the Catholic faith, as John XXII.]—Stella, [*Enarrat.*] *in cap. xxii. Lucæ Evangel.* [tom. ii. p. 339. col. 1. ed. Antverp. 1622.]—Et, Almain in III. *Sentent.* Distinct. xxiv. Q[uæst.] i. in fine. Multæ sunt decretales hæreticæ. [There are many heretical decretals.] And so they erred as Popes.

[50] S. Augustin. *Ep.* 1. [lib. ad Bonifacium, seu *Epist.* clxxxv. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 663. C. Migne, ii. 815.] —Columbæ non erant qui Ecclesiam dissipaverunt? Accipitres erant, milvi erant. Non laniat columba. [They who scattered the Church were not doves. They were hawks, they were falcons. The dove does not mutilate.]—S. Augustin. *in Johannis Evang.* [cap. i.] Tractat. v. 12. [*Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 325. C. Migne, iii. 1419.]

[CHAPTER VII.] separation in this body, or the parts of it one from another were it never so easy to determine, as I think it is most difficult, I would not venture to set it down in particular, lest, in these times of discord, I might be thought to open a door for schism; which surely I will never do, unless it be to let it out. But that there are errors in doctrine, and some of them such as most manifestly endanger salvation, in the Church of Rome, is evident to them that will not shut their eyes. The proof whereof runs through the particular points that are between us; and so is too long for this discourse. Now here A. C. would fain have a reason given him,
A. C. p. 55. "why I did endeavour to show what cause the Protestants had to make that rent or division, if I did not grant that they made it?" Why truly in this reasonable demand I will satisfy him. I did it, partly because I had granted in the general, that corruption in manners was no sufficient cause of separation of one particular church from another; and therefore it lay upon me at least to name in general what was: and partly because he and his party will needs have it so, that we did make the separation; and therefore, though I did not grant it, yet amiss I thought it could not be to declare, by way of supposition, that if the Protestants did at first separate from the Church of Rome, they had reason so to do.
A. C. p. 56. For A. C. himself confesses "that error in doctrine of the faith is a just cause of separation; so just, as that no cause is just but that." Now, had I leisure to descend into particulars, or will to make the rent in the Church wider, it is no hard matter to prove that the Church of Rome hath erred in the doctrine of faith, and dangerously too: and I doubt I shall afterwards descend to particulars, A. C.'s importunity forcing me to it.

[A. C. p. 55.] ℣. . . . which when the general Church would not reform, it was lawful for particular Churches to reform themselves.

§ 24. ℟. I. Is it then such a strange thing that a particular Church may reform itself, if the general will not? I had thought, and do so still, that in point of reformation of either manners or doctrine, it is lawful for the Church since Christ, to do as the Church before Christ did, and might do. The Church before Christ consisted of Jews and proselytes. This Church came to have a separation upon a most ungodly policy of Jeroboam's, so that it
1 Kings xii. 27. never pieced together again. To a common council to reform all, they would not come. Was it not lawful for Judah to reform

SECTION XXIV.

herself, when Israel would not join? Sure it was, or else the prophet deceives me, that says expressly, "Though Israel transgress, yet let not Judah sin." And St. Jerome expounds it of this very particular sin of heresy and error in religion.[51] Nor can you say that Israel, from the time of the separation, was not a Church;[52] for there were true prophets in it, Elias[53] and Elisæus,[54] and others, and "thousands that had not bowed knees to Baal." And there was salvation for these, which cannot be in the ordinary way, where there is no Church. And God threatens to "cast them away, to wander among the nations," and be no congregation, no Church. Therefore He had not yet cast them away *in non Ecclesiam*, "into no-Church." And they are expressly called "the people of the Lord" in Jehu's time, and so continued long after. Nor can you plead that Judah is your part, and the ten tribes ours, as some of you do; for if that be true you must grant that the multitude and greater number is ours: and where, then, is Multitude, your numerous note of the Church? For the ten tribes were more than the two. But you cannot plead it: for certainly if any "calves" be set up, they are in Dan and in Bethel—they are not ours.

Hos. iv. 15.

1 Kings xix. 18.

Hos. ix. 17.

2 Kings ix. 6.

II. Besides, to reform what is amiss in doctrine or manners, is as lawful for a particular Church, as it is to publish and promulgate anything that is catholic in either. And your question, *Quo judice?* lies alike against both. And yet I think it may be proved

[51] Super hæreticis prona intelligentia est.] It is easy to see he means heretics.]—S. Hieron. [*Comment.* lib. i. in *Osee prophet.* cap. iv. 15. *Op.*, tom. iii. col. 1264.]

[52] Nec tamen [omni modo] cessavit Deus [non solum illum regem (sc. Hieroboam), verum etiam successores ejus et impietatis imitatores,] populumque ipsum arguere per prophetas. Nam ibi extiterunt magni illi et insignes prophetæ, [qui etiam mirabilia multa fecerunt,] Elias, et Elisæus [discipulus ejus. Nor did God at all cease to persuade that king (Jeroboam) and also all his successors and imitators in his impious conduct, as well as the people in general. For there appeared among them those great and remarkable prophets, who further worked numerous miracles, Elijah and his pupil Elisha.]—S. Augustin. *de civitate Dei*, lib. xvii. cap. 22. [*Op.* tom. vii. col. 406. B. Migne, vii. 557.]—Nomen cultumque Ejus multi religiose intra se haberent. De quo numero, eorumve posteris, septem illa millia [vivorum] fuisse statuo, qui in persecutione sub [rege] Achabo Deum sibi ab idolatria immunes reservasse, [quosque] genua ante Baal non flexisse, [scriptum est, 3 Reg. xix. 18.] [His name and His worship many guarded piously in their hearts. Of which number or their descendants, evidently were those seven thousand living men who, in the persecution under King Ahab, according to the Scripture, God kept for Himself free from idolatry, and who never bowed the knee to Baal.]—Franc. Moncæus, *de vitulo aureo*, lib. i. cap. 12. [apud *Criticos Sacros*, tom. ix. sive *Tractat. Biblicor.* tom. ii. col. 4456. ed. Londin. 1660.]

[53] *1 Kings* xvii. sub Achabo.

[54] *2 Kings* iii. sub Jehoram filio Achabi.

[CHAPTER VII.]

to endanger life and all, rather than be cured in time by a physician of a weaker knowledge and a less able hand? Secondly, We live to see since, if we had stayed and expected a General Council, what manner of one we should have had, if any. For that at Trent was neither general nor free: and for the errors which Rome had contracted, it confirmed them; it cured them not. And yet I much doubt, whether ever that Council, such as it was, would have been called, if some provincial and national synods, under supreme and regal power, had not first set upon this great work of reformation; which I heartily wish had in all places been as orderly and happily pursued, as the work was right Christian and good in itself. But human frailty, and the heats and distempers of men, as well as the cunning of the devil, would not suffer that. For even in this sense also, "the wrath of man doth not accomplish the will of God." But I have learned not to reject the good which God hath wrought, for any evil which men may fasten to it.

James i. 20.

V. And yet if, for all this, you think it is better for us to be blind than to open your own eyes, let me tell you, very grave and learned men, and of your own party, have taught me, that when the universal Church will not, or for the iniquities of the times cannot, obtain and settle a free General Council, it is lawful, nay sometimes necessary, to reform gross abuses by a national, or a provincial. For, besides Alb. Magnus, whom I quoted before,[61] Gerson, the learned and devout chancellor of Paris, tells us plainly, "that he will not deny but that the Church may be reformed by parts; and that this is necessary, and that to effect it, Provincial Councils may suffice; and, in some things, Diocesan."[62] And again, "Either you should reform all estates of the Church in a General Council, or command them to be reformed in Provincial Councils."[63] Now Gerson lived about two hundred

[61] Sect. xxiv. No. 2. [*ubi sup.* p. 176. note 55.]

[62] Nolo tamen dicere, quin in multis partibus possit Ecclesia per suas partes reformari: immo hoc necesse esset; sed ad hoc agendum sufficerent concilia provincialia. [I do not, however, like to say that the Church cannot in many countries be reformed part by part; certainly this would be necessary, but for such a course provincial councils would be sufficient.]—Johan. Gerson. *tractat. de Concilio generali unius obedientiæ*, part i. p. 222. F. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 26. B. ed. Dupin.]

[63] Omnes ecclesiæ status vel generali concilio reformetis, aut in conciliis provincialibus reformari mandetis.—Johan. Gerson. *declarat. defectuum virorum Ecclesiasticorum*, par. i. p. 209. B. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 317. D. ed. Dupin. Gerson was the leader of the French Divines who tried to end the great Schism. He played a principal part at the Council of Constance in 1415.]

years since. But this right of provincial synods, that they might decree in causes of faith, and in cases of reformation, where corruptions had crept into the sacraments of Christ, was practised much above a thousand years ago by many, both national and provincial, synods. For the Council at Rome[64] under Pope Sylvester, an. 324, condemned Photinus and Sabellius. (And their heresies were of high nature against the faith.) The Council at Gangra,[65] about the same time, condemned Eustathius for his condemning of marriage as unlawful. The first Council at Carthage,[66] being a provincial, condemned rebaptization much about the year 348. The Provincial Council at Aquileia,[67] in the year 381, in which St. Ambrose was present, condemned Palladius and Secundinus for embracing the Arian heresy. The second Council of Carthage[68] handled and decreed the belief and preaching of the Trinity; and this a little after the year 424. The Council of Milevis in Africa,[69] in which St. Augustine was present, condemned the whole course of the heresy of Pelagius, that great and bewitching heresy, in the year 416. The second Council at Orange,[70] a provincial too, handled the great controversies about grace and free-will, and set the Church right in them, in the year 444 [529.] The third Council at Toledo,[71] a national one, in the year 589, determined many things against the Arian heresy, about the very prime articles of faith, under fourteen several anathemas. The fourth Council at Toledo did not only handle matters of faith for the reformation of that people, but even added also some things to the creed, "which were not expressly delivered in former creeds."[72] Nay, the bishops did

[64] Concil. Roman. II. sub Sylvestro. —[*Concil.* tom. i. col. 1542. B.]

[65] Concil. Gang. Can. i.—[*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 421. B.]

[66] Concil. Carth. I. Can. i.—[*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 714. A.]

[67] Concil. Aquiliens.—[*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 979. C.]

[68] Concil. Carth. II. Can. i.—[*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 1159. B. The ordinary, but incorrect, date of this council is 397.]

[69] Quædam de causis fidei, unde nunc quæstio Pelagianorum imminet, in hoc cœtu sanctissimo primitus tractentur, etc. [Some points on matters of faith were handled originally in this most reverend Asembly; because the Pelagian question was now threatening.]—Aurel. Carthaginensis [Episcop.] *in Præfat. Concil. Milevit.* apud Caranzam, [*Summ. Concil.* p. 203. ed. Duac. 1679.]

[70] Concil. Arausican. II. Can. i. ii. etc.—[*Concil.* tom. iv. col. 1667, et seqq.]

[71] Concil. Tolet. III.—[*Concil.* tom. v. col. 997. The anathemas of this council were twenty-four in number. —*ibid.* col. 1003—1005.]

[72] Quæ omnia in aliis Symbolis explicite tradita non sunt.—Concil. Tolet. IV. Can. i.—[*Concil.* tom. v. col. 1703. The words cited by Laud are not from the decree of the council; but they are part of Caranza's Summary of the first Canon.—*Summ. Concil.* p. 388. Note by Dr. Scott.]

but that as the universal Catholic Church would have reformed herself, had she been in all parts freed of the Roman yoke; so while she was for the most in these Western parts under that yoke, the Church of Rome was, if not the only, yet the chief, hindrance of reformation. And then in this sense, it is more than clear, that if the Roman Church will neither reform, nor suffer reformation, it is lawful for any other particular Church to reform itself, so long as it doth it peaceably and orderly, and keeps itself to the foundation, and free from sacrilege.[81]

[*Laud does not enter into the question of the Synod of 1562; and his omission so to do was afterwards severely commented upon. The comments were answered by Bishop Stillingfleet, in the Book which he wrote to defend Laud, published immediately after the Restoration: viz. in 1665.*

NOTE FROM STILLINGFLEET'S VINDICATION OF LAUD, ii. 144-149.

But you seem to say much more to the second, "That the Reformation was not managed by a lawful power, nor carried on in a due manner"; for you offer to prove that the national synod, 1562, was no lawful synod, in these words: "For is it not notorious, that that pretended synod, A.D. 1562, were all manifest usurpers? is it not manifest that they all by force intruded themselves both into the sees of other lawful bishops, and into the cures of other lawful pastors, quietly and canonically possessed of them before the said intrusion? Can those be accounted a lawful national council of England, or lawfully to represent the English Church, who never had any lawful, that is canonical and just vocation, mission or jurisdiction given them to and over the English Nation?" Two things you object as the great reasons why those persons who sat in the Convocation, A.D. 1562, could make no lawful synod, and those are intrusion and want of a lawful mission; which shall be particularly examined. The first charge is of intrusion, which you would seem to aggravate by several circumstances, "that they intruded themselves," and that by force;

[81] And this a particular Church may do; but not a schism. For a schism can never be peaceable, nor orderly, and seldom free from sacrilege. Out of which respects, it may be, as well as for the grievousness of the crime, St. Augustine calls it Sacrilegium Schismatis, *de Baptismo contra Donatist.* lib. i. cap. 8. [lib. ii. cap. 7. *Op.*, tom. ix. col. 102. B. Migne, ix. 133. *Op.* tom., ix. col. 672. C. Migne, ix. 747.] For usually they go together.

and not some, but all; and that "into the sees of other lawful bishops, and cures of lawful pastors." But how true these circumstances are, must appear by a true account of the matters of fact relating to these things in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign. How false that is, "that all intruded themselves," is notorious to anyone who understands anything of those times: for this convocation was held in the fifth year of Queen Elizabeth; and in the first of her reign, of twenty-six Cathedral Churches, there were but fourteen or fifteen bishops then living in England: for the sees of Salisbury and Oxford fell vacant A.D. 1557, and were not supplied in the time of Queen Mary; Hereford, Bristol, Bangor, were vacant by the death of the several bishops some weeks before Queen Mary; Canterbury by the death of Cardinal Pole the same day with the Queen; Norwich and Gloucester a few weeks after her; and so likewise Rochester. Worcester and St. Asaph became vacant by the voluntary exile of Pates and Goldwell, the bishops thereof: so that but fifteen bishops were then living and remaining in England; and were all those who supplied these vacant sees intruders? A strange kind of intrusion into dead men's places! So then this circumstance is notoriously false, "that they all by force intruded themselves into the sees of other lawful bishops." But let us see whether the other are more justly charged with a forcible intrusion into the sees of the other bishops: for which we must consider what the proceedings were in reference to them. It appears then, that in the first year of the Queen, the oath of supremacy formed and enjoined in the time of Henry VIII., was, in the first parliament of Queen Elizabeth, revived, for the better securing the Queen of the fidelity of her subjects; but yet it was so revived, that several considerable passages in the act concerning it were upon mature deliberation mitigated, both as to the Queen's title, which was not supreme head, but supreme governor; a title which Queen Mary had used before, as appears by an act passed in the third session of parliament in her time; and likewise as to the penalty; for whereas the stat. 28 Henry VIII. c. 10, was so very severe, "that whosoever did extol the authority of the bishop of Rome was for the first offence within the compass of a premunire, and for refusing to take the oath was guilty of treason," it passed now, in Queen Elizabeth's time, only with this penalty, "that such who refused it should be excluded such places of honour and profit as they held in the Church or Commonwealth; and that such as should maintain or defend the authority, pre-eminence, power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate whatsoever, should be three times convicted before he suffered the pains of death." Upon the expiring of the parliament commissioners were appointed to require the bishops to take the oath of supremacy according to the law made to that purpose, which being tendered to them, they all (Kitchen of Llandaff only excepted)

[CHAPTER VII.] unanimously refused it, although they had taken it before as priests or bishops in the reign of Henry VIII. or Edward VI.: but whether by some secret intimations from Rome, or their own obstinacy, they were resolved rather to undergo the penalty of the law than to take it now; and accordingly before the end of that year they were deprived of their bishoprics. So that the question about the intrusion of those bishops who came into their sees depends upon the legality of the deprivation of these: and certainly whosoever considers their former carriage towards the Queen in refusing to assist at her coronation and some of them threatening to excommunicate her, instead of disputing at Westminster, as they had solemnly engaged to do, joined with this contumacy in refusing the oath, will find that these persons did not unjustly suffer this deprivation; for which I need not run out into the prince's power over ecclesiastical persons; for you have given a sufficient reason for it yourself in that acknowledgment of yours, "that the bishops, and the King too" (meaning King Henry) "left the pope in possession of all he could rightly challenge." If this be true, that notwithstanding the stat. 28 Henry VIII., notwithstanding the oath of supremacy then taken, the pope might enjoy all that belonged to him of divine right, he might then do the same, notwithstanding this oath in Queen Elizabeth's time, which was only reviving the former with some mitigation; and what could it be then else but obstinacy and contumacy in them to refuse it? And therefore the plea which you make for those whom you call the Henry-Bishops will sufficiently condemn these present bishops whom we now speak of: for if those bishops only renounced the pope's canonical and acquired jurisdiction here in England, as you say, *i.e.* that authority and jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters which the pope exercised here by virtue of the canons, prescriptions, and other titles of human right, and gave it to the king; yet they never renounced or deprived him of that part of his authority which is far more intrinsical to his office and of divine right; they never denied the pope's sovereign power to teach the universal church, and determine all controversies of faith whatsoever in a general council." If these things, I say, be true which you confidently assert, the more inexcusable were these bishops for refusing that oath of supremacy, which they had not only taken in King Henry's time, but which, by your own confession, takes away nothing of the pope's authority in relation to the whole catholic church. And by this means their obstinacy appeared so great as might justly deserve a deprivation; it being certainly in the power of the King and bishops to assert their own rights in opposition to any canons or prescriptions whatsoever of merely human right, so that, by your own confession, the more excusable the Henry-Bishops were, as you call them, the less excusable the Mary-bishops were (as, to follow you, we must call them) in refusing the oath of supremacy when tendered to them. Was it lawful then in King Henry's time to take

this oath or not? if not, then King Henry's bishops are infinitely to blame for taking it, and you for defending them: if it was lawful then, why not in Queen Elizabeth's time? had she not as much reason to impose it as her father? had she not as much power to do it, when one of the chief refusers, Heath, archbishop of York, and then lord chancellor of England, did, upon the first notice of the death of Queen Mary, declare to the house of commons, "that the succession of the crown did of right belong to the princess Elizabeth, whose title they conceived to be free from all legal questions"? this could be then no plea at all for them. So that if any persons, through the greatest obstinacy, might be deprived by a prince of their ecclesiastical preferments, these might; and when you can prove that in no case a prince hath power to deprive ecclesiastical persons, you will say more to your purpose than yet you have done: but till you have done that it remains clear that these bishops were justly deprived; and if so what was to be done with their vacant sees? must they be kept vacant still, or such be put into them who were guilty of the same fault with themselves in refusing the oath when tendered to them? if not such, then it was necessary that other fit persons should be legally consecrated and invested in them; and so they were, the places being supplied by worthy persons, the archbishop of Canterbury being consecrated by a canonical number of Edward-bishops, and the rest duly consecrated by other hands. And for all this, must all these persons be "intruders, and intrude themselves by force, and that into the places of other lawful bishops," when so many sees were actually vacant, and the rest by due form of law, into which other bishops were elected, and legally consecrated, notwithstanding the putid fable of the Nag's-head ordination? which hath so often and so evidently been disproved, that I am glad to find you have so much modesty as not to mention it. These bishops being thus legally invested in their places, to whom did the care and government of the English Church belong? to these, or to those who were justly deprived? if to these, were not they then the due representatives of the English Church in a national synod, who, with those of the lower house of convocation, make up a true national council? and if so, it belonged to them as such to consider what appertained to the faith and government of the Church of England: for they undertook not to prescribe to the whole world, that they leave to the Bishop and Church of Rome (not as legally belonging to them, but arrogantly usurped by them), but to draw up articles of religion, which should be owned by all such who enjoyed any place of trust in the Church of England. So that in all this they were neither intruders, neither did they act anything beyond their place and authority. But you would seem to quarrel with their vocation, mission and jurisdiction, as though it were not lawful, *i.e.* canonical and just: all these are your own words, and they are but words, for not one syllable like a proof is suggested. I tell you then, (not to

[CHAPTER VII.] spend time in a needless vindication of the vocation of the bishops and pastors of the Church of England, when you give us no reason to question it,) that by the same arguments that you can prove that you have any lawful bishops and pastors in your Church, it will appear that we have too; and that our vocation and mission is far more consonant to the apostolic and primitive Church than yours is.]

[CHAPTER VIII.

Who is to be the Judge? The Claims of Rome.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.

SECTION XXV.

Evidently neither Romanists nor Protestants can be judges in the cause between them; but a General Council deciding by Scripture. It was Rome that prevented a General Council. But what will the powers of a General Council be? The whole Church cannot err in points necessary to salvation; but there is need to be careful in defining the term "the whole Church." The Scriptural texts on the inspiration of the Church are examined, viz., St. Matt. xvi. 18, St. Matt. xxviii. 21, St. Luke xxii. 32, St. John xiv. 16 and 17 and 26, St. John xvi. 13. None of these prove that the whole Church will err in nothing; but the proof is sufficient that the whole Church will not err in fundamentals.

But what is "the whole Church"? The Jesuit answers, "Rome is the whole Church." Laud answers that Rome is a provincial and a particular Church. Each particular Church has the right to reform itself. But Rome has claimed and wielded a power which does not come from Christ. The Roman Patriarch may have had a primacy of order, being Bishop of the Capital City of the World; he was never ruler, nor intended to be ruler of the whole Church. St. Augustine does not acknowledge his authority, and the African Church of Augustine's time was independent. Each Patriarch was supreme in his own jurisdiction; and Britain always had her own Primate: English independence was acknowledged by the Pope even as late as the twelfth century. For centuries the Popes confessed the right of the Emperor to ratify the Pope's election. The rise of the Papal Power is sketched, up to Gregory VII.

The Jesuit quotes Irenaeus as declaring Papal supremacy in his time: the passage is examined. He also maintains that St. Peter was King after Christ; and the Popes are St. Peter's successors, and therefore Heads and Kings after him. Epiphanius (Bishop in Cyprus

[CHAPTER VIII.] *A.D. 368-403) quotes very strongly the passage St. Matt. xvi. 18 as applying to St. Peter; but he does not consider him Head of the Church; and twice speaks of St. James as succeeding our Lord in the principality of the Church. St. Peter received the keys, just as the other Apostles did. Theophylact (A.D. 1072) is the first father quoted by Bellarmine as using St. Luke xxii. 32 to establish St. Peter's primacy: he misrepresents his words. Nor does St. John xxi. 15 establish even the formal supremacy of St. Peter.*]

A. C. p. 57. ℣. I asked, *Quo judice*, did this appear to be so? Which question I asked, as not thinking it equity that Protestants in their own cause should be accusers, witnesses, and judges of the Roman Church.

§ 25. ℟. I. You do well to tell the reason now why you asked this question; for you did not discover it at the Conference: if you had, you might then have received your answer. It is most true: no man in common equity ought to be suffered to be accuser, witness, and judge in his own cause. But is there not as little reason and equity too, that any man that is to be accused should be the accused, and yet witness and judge in his own cause? If the first may hold, no man shall be innocent; and if the last, none will be nocent. And what do we here with "in their own cause against the Roman Church"? Why, is it not your own, too, against the Protestant Church? And if it be a cause common to both, as certain it is, then neither part alone may be judge: if neither alone may judge, then either they must be judged by a third which stands indifferent to both,[1]—and that is the Scripture; or if there be a jealousy or doubt of the sense of the Scripture, they must either both repair to the exposition of the primitive Church, and submit to that; or both call, and submit to, a General Council, which shall be lawfully called, and fairly and freely held, with indifferency to all parties: and that must judge the difference according to Scripture, which must be their rule as well as private men's.

A. C. p. 58. II. And here, after some loud cry against the pride and insolent madness of the Protestants, A. C. adds, "that the Church of Rome is the principal and mother Church; and that, therefore, though it be against common equity that subjects and children should be accusers, witnesses, judges, and executioners against their prince and mother in any case, yet it is not absurd that, in

[1] Sect. xxi. No. 9. [*ubi sup.* p. 165.]

some cases, the prince or mother may accuse, witness, judge, and, if need be, execute justice, against unjust and rebellious subjects, or evil children." How far forth Rome is a prince over the whole Church, or a mother of it, will come to be shewed at after. In the meantime, though I cannot grant her to be either, yet let us suppose her to be both, that A. C.'s argument may have all the strength it can have. Nor shall it force me, as plausible as it seems, to weaken the just power of princes over their subjects, or of mothers over their children, to avoid the shock of this argument. For though A. C. may tell us "it is not absurd in some cases," yet I would fain have him name any one moderate prince that ever thought it just, or took it upon him, to be accuser, and witness, and judge in any cause of moment against his subjects, but that the law had liberty to judge between them. For the great philosopher tells us, "that the chief magistrate is *custos iuris*, the guardian and keeper of the law; and if of the law, then both of that equity and equality which is due unto them that are under him."[2] And even Tiberius himself, in the cause of Silanus, when Dolabella would have flattered him into more power than in wisdom he thought fit then to take to himself, he put him off thus: "No; the laws grow less where such power enlarges: nor is absolute power to be used where there may be an orderly proceeding by law."[3] And for parents, it is true, when children are young, they may chastise them without other accuser or witness than themselves; and yet the children are to give them reverence. And it is presumed that natural affection will prevail so far with them, that they will not punish them too much. For all experience tells us, almost to the loss of education, that they punish them too little, even when there is cause.[4] Yet when children are grown up, and come to some full use of their own reason, the Apostle's rule is, "Parents, provoke not your children." And if the Apostle prevail not with froward parents, there is a magistrate and a law to relieve even a son against unnatural parents, as it was in the case of T. Manlius against his over-imperious

SECTION XXV.

Heb. xii. 9.

Col. iii. 21.

[2] ἔστι δὲ ὁ ἄρχων φύλαξ τοῦ δικαίου· εἰ δὲ τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ τοῦ ἴσου.—Aristot. *Eth.* [*Nicom.* lib. v.] cap. 6. [*Op.*, tom. ix. p. 101. ed. Bekker.]

[3] Minui iura quotiens gliscat potestas; nec utendum imperio, ubi legibus agi possit.—Tacit. *Annal.* lib. iii. [cap. 69. ed. Brotier.]

[4] God used Samuel as a messenger against Eli for his overmuch indulgence to his sons. *1 Sam.* iii. 13. And yet Samuel himself committed the very same fault concerning his own sons. *1 Sam.* viii. 3-5. And this indulgence occasioned the change of the civil government, as the former was the loss of the priesthood.

[CHAPTER VIII.]

father.[5] And an express law there was among the Jews, when children were grown up and fell into great extremities, that the parents should then bring them to the magistrate, and not be too busy in such cases with their own power. So suppose Rome be a prince, yet her subjects must be tried by God's law, the Scripture: and suppose her a mother, yet there is, or ought to be, remedy against her for her children that are grown up, if she forget all good nature, and turn step-dame to them.

Deut. xxi. 19.

III. Well, the reason why the Jesuit asked the question, *Quo judice?* "Who should be judge?" he says was this; Because there is no equity in it, that the Protestants should be judges in their own cause. But now upon more deliberation A. C. tells us, as if he knew the Jesuit's mind as well as himself, (as sure I think he doth,) "that the Jesuit directed this question chiefly against that speech of mine, That there were errors in doctrine of faith, and that in the General Church, as the Jesuit understood my meaning." The Jesuit here took my meaning right. For I confess I said there were errors in doctrine, and dangerous ones too, in the Church of Rome. I said likewise, that when the General Church could not, or would not, reform such, it was lawful for particular Churches to reform themselves. But then I added, "that the General Church (not universally taken, but in these western parts) fell into those errors, being swayed in these latter ages by the predominant power of the Church of Rome, under whose government it was for the most part forced." And all men of understanding know how oft and how easily an over-potent member carries the whole with it, in any body, natural, politic, or ecclesiastical.

A. C. p. 57.

A. C. p. 57.

IV. Yea, but A. C. tells us, "that never any competent judge did so censure the Church; and, indeed, that no power on earth, or in hell itself, can so far prevail against the General Church as to make it err generally in any one point of divine truth, and much less to teach anything by its full authority to be a matter of faith which is contrary to divine truth, expressed or involved in

[5] Crimini ei tribunus inter cætera dabat, quod filium juvenem, nullius probri compertum, extorrem urbe, domo, penatibus, foro, luce, congressu æqualium prohibitum, in opus servile, prope in carcerem, atque in ergastulum, dederit. [Among other charges brought against him by the tribune was this, that he had sent his young son, without any crime, away from the city, had forbidden him his home, his worship, his business, the light of the sun, the intercourse of his companions, and had placed him almost in prison and actually at forced labour to the work of a slave.]—Liv. dec. 1. lib. vii. [cap. 4.]

Scriptures rightly understood. And that, therefore, no reformation of faith can be needful in the General Church, but only in particular Churches." And for proof of this he cites St. Matt. xvi. and xxviii., St. Luke xxii., St. John xiv. and xvi. In this troublesome and quarrelling age, I am most unwilling to meddle with the erring of the Church in general. The Church of England is content to pass that over. And though she tells us, "That the Church of Rome hath erred even in matters of faith,"[6] yet of the erring of the Church in general she is modestly silent. But since A. C. will needs have it, that the whole Church did never generally err in any one point of faith, he should do well to distinguish before he be so peremptory. For if he mean no more than "that the whole Universal Church of Christ cannot universally err in any one point of faith simply necessary to all men's salvation," he fights against no adversary that I know, but his own fiction. For the most learned Protestants grant it.[7] But if he mean that the whole Church cannot err in any one point of divine truth in general, which, though by sundry consequences deduced from the principles, is yet a point of faith, and may prove dangerous to the salvation of some, which believe it and practise after it, as his words seem to import, especially if in these the Church shall presume to determine without her proper guide, the Scripture, as Bellarmine says she may, and yet not err;[8] then, perhaps, it may be said, and without any wrong to the Catholic Church, that the whole militant Church hath erred in such a point of divine truth and of faith. Nay, A. C. confesses expressly in his very next words, "that the whole Church may at some time not know all divine truths, which afterwards it may learn by study of Scripture, and otherwise." So, then, in A. C.'s judgment the

SECTION XXV.

A. C. p. 58.

[6] Art. XIX.

[7] [Nos] si demus [illud primum,] errare non posse Ecclesiam in rebus ad salutem necessariis: hic sensus noster est, ideo hoc esse, quod abdicata omni sua sapientia, a Spiritu Sancto doceri se per verbum Dei patitur. [If we should first grant that the Church cannot err in matters necessary to salvation, this is our meaning, that this has been truly the case, because she has surrendered all her own wisdom, and allows herself to be taught by the Holy Spirit through the Word of God.]—Calvin. *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 8. § 13. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 310.] And this also is our sense. *Vide supra*, sect. xxi. No. 5. [p. 159.]

[8] Nostra [igitur] sententia est, Ecclesiam absolute non posse errare, nec in rebus absolute necessariis, nec in aliis, quæ credenda, vel facienda nobis proponit, sive habeantur expresse in Scripturis, sive non. [Our decision then is that the Church cannot absolutely err, neither in matters absolutely necessary, nor in other matters which she tells us must be believed or done, whether they are expressly found in Scripture or not.]—Bellarmin. *de Eccl. Mil.* lib. iii. cap. 14. § 4.

[CHAPTER VIII.]

whole militant Church may at some time not know all divine truths. Now, that which knows not all, must be ignorant of some; and that which is ignorant of some, may possibly err in one point or other; the rather, because he confesses the knowledge of it must be got by learning; and learners may mistake and err, especially where the lesson is divine truth out of Scripture, out of difficult Scripture. For were it of plain and easy Scripture that he speaks, the whole Church could not at any time be without the knowledge of it. And for aught I yet see, the whole Church militant hath no greater warrant against not erring in, than against not knowing of, the points of divine truth. For in St. John xvi. there is as large a promise to the Church of knowing all points of divine truth, as A. C., or any Jesuit, can produce for her not erring in any. And if she may be ignorant or mistaken in learning of any point of divine truth, doubtless in that state of ignorance she may both err, and teach her error; yea, and teach that to be divine truth which is not; nay, perhaps teach that as a matter of divine truth which is contrary to divine truth, always provided it be not in any point simply fundamental, of which the whole Catholic Church cannot be ignorant, and in which it cannot err, as hath before been proved.[9]

John xvi. 13.

A. C. p. 57.

V. As for the places of Scripture which A. C. cites to prove that the whole Church cannot err generally in any one point of divine truth, be it fundamental or not, they are known places, all of them, and are alleged by A. C. three several times in this short tract, and to three several purposes. Here, to prove that the Universal Church cannot err; before this, to prove that the tradition of the present Church cannot err; after this, to prove that the Pope cannot err. He should have done well to have added these places a fourth time, to prove that General Councils cannot err. For so doth both Stapleton[10] and Bellarmine.[11] Sure A. C. and his fellows are hard driven, when they must fly to the same places for such different purposes: for a Pope may err, where a Council doth not; and a General Council may err, where the Catholic Church cannot. And, therefore, it is not likely that these places should serve alike for all. The first place

A. C. p. 57.

A. C. p. 53.

A. C. pp. 58, and 73.

[9] Sect. xxi. No. 5. [*ubi sup.* p. 159.]

[10] Stapleton. *Relect.* [*Controv.*] in præf. ad lectorem. [*Op.*, tom. i. pp. 511-515.]

[11] [Concilia generalia a pontifice confirmata, errare non posse, ex scripturis demonstratur. General Councils confirmed by the Pope, cannot err; this can be proved from Scripture.] —Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 2. [in tit.]

is St. Matthew xvi. There Christ told St. Peter, and we believe it most assuredly, "That hell gates shall never be able to prevail against His Church." But that is, that they shall not prevail to make the Church Catholic apostatize, and fall quite away from Christ, or err in absolute fundamentals, which amounts to as much. But the promise reaches not to this, That the Church shall never err; no, not in the lightest matters of faith. For it will not follow: Hell gates shall not prevail against the Church; Therefore hellish devils shall not tempt or assault, and batter it. And thus St. Augustine understood the place: "It may fight (yea, and be wounded too) but it cannot be wholly overcome."[12] And Bellarmine himself applies it to prove that the visible Church of Christ cannot *deficere*, "err so as quite to fall away."[13] Therefore, in his judgment, this is a true and a safe sense of this text of Scripture. But as for not erring at all, in any point of divine truth, and so making the Church absolutely infallible, that is neither a true nor a safe sense of this scripture. And it is very remarkable, that whereas this text hath been so much beaten upon by writers of all sorts, there is no one Father of the Church for twelve hundred years after Christ, the counterfeit of partial Decretals of some Popes excepted, that ever concluded the infallibility of the Church out of this place; but her non-deficiency, that hath been, and is, justly deduced hence. And here I challenge A. C. and all that party to show the contrary, if they can. The next place of Scripture is St. Matthew xxviii., the promise of Christ that "He will be with them to the end of the world." But this, in the general voice of the Fathers of the Church, is a promise of assistance and protection, not of an infallibility, of the Church.[14] And Pope Leo himself enlarges

Section XXV.

Matt. xvi. 18.

Matt. xxviii. 21.

[12] [Ipsa est Ecclesia sancta, Ecclesia una, Ecclesia vera, Ecclesia catholica, contra omnes hæreses pugnans:] pugnare potest, expugnari non potest. [This is the holy Church, the one Church, the Catholic Church, fighting against all heretics; she may have to fight; she cannot be defeated.]—S. Augustin. lib. *de symbolo, ad catechumen.* cap. vi. [*Op.*, tom. vi. col. 554. E.]

[13] Bellarmin. *de Eccl. Milit.* lib. iii. cap. 13. § 1, 2. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 145. D.]

[14] S. Hilar. [Pictav. Tractat.] in *Psalmum* cxxiv. [cap. 6. *Op.*, col. 405. A. ed. Benedict. Migne, i. 683.] —S. Prosp. [Aquitan. seu potius ignoti auctoris,] *de vocat.* [*omn.*] *gentium*, lib. ii. cap. 2. [inter *Op.*, S. Prosper. p. 888. col. 2. D. ed. Paris. 1711. Migne, 638.]—S. Leon. [Magn.] Serm. ii. *de Resurrect. Domini*, cap. 3. [Serm. lxxii. (al. lxx.) *Op.*, tom. i. col. 286. ed. Ballerini. Migne, i. 391.] —Et, [*Id.*] *Epist.* xxxi. [*Epist.* lx. (al. xlviii.) ad Pulcheriam Augustam, *Op.*, tom. i. col. 982. Migne, i. 873.] —S. Isidor. [Hispalens. *Mysticorum expositiones Sacramentorum*, seu, *Quæst. in Vet. Test.*,] in *Josue.* cap. xii. [2. *Op.*, tom. v. p. 486. ed. Lorenzanæ, Romæ, 1802.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

this presence and providence of Christ to all those things which He committed to the execution of His ministers.[15] But no word of infallibility is to be found there. And indeed since Christ, according to His promise, is present with His ministers in all these things, and that one and a chief of these "all" is the preaching of His word to the people; it must follow that Christ should be present with all His ministers that preach His word, to make them infallible: which daily experience tells us is not so. The third place urged by A. C. is St. Luke xxii., where the prayer of Christ will effect no more than His promise hath performed; neither of them implying an infallibility for or in the Church against all errors whatsoever. And this, almost all his own side confess, is spoken either of St. Peter's person only, or of him and his successors,[a] or both.[16] Of the Church it is not spoken, and therefore cannot prove an unerring power in it. For how can that place prove the Church cannot err, which speaks not at all of the Church? And it is observable, too, that when the divines of Paris expounded this place, that Christ here prayed for St. Peter, as he represented the whole Catholic Church, and obtained for it that the faith of the Catholic Church *nunquam deficeret*, "should never so err as quite to fall away," Bellarmine is so stiff for the Pope, that he says expressly, "This exposition of the Parisians is false," and that this text cannot be meant of the Catholic Church.[17] Not be meant of it? Then, certainly,

Luke xxii. 32.

[a] ["successors both" in Editt. 1673 and 1686.]

[15] Nec unquam ab his abest, quæ ministris Suis exequenda commisit. [Nor is the Saviour ever absent from those tasks which He has given to His ministers to carry out for Him.]—S. Leon. Magn. *Epist.* xci. cap. 2. [*Epist.* cviii. (al. lxxxiii.) ad Theodorum Episcop. Forojul. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 1174. ed. Ballerini. Migne, i. 1012.]

[16] Est igitur tertia [expositio vera, quod Dominus duo privilegia Petro impetraverit. Unum, ut ipse non posset unquam veram fidem amittere, quantumvis tentaretur a diabolo . . . alterum privilegium est, ut ipse tanquam pontifex non posset unquam docere aliquid contra fidem, sive, ut in sede ejus nunquam inveniretur, qui doceret contra veram fidem. Ex quibus privilegiis, primum fortasse non manavit ad posteros: at secundum sine dubio manavit ad posteros, sive successores. There is, then, a third explanation and the true one; the Lord asked for Peter two special gifts, the one that he should himself never be able to lose the true faith, however much tempted of the Devil. . . . the second that he as Pontiff should never be able to teach anything against the faith, nor that anyone should ever be found in his See teaching against the true faith. Of which special gifts, the first perhaps did not pass on to his descendants, but the second without doubt passed on to his descendants or successors.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pontif.* lib. iv. cap. 3. § 4. He understood the place of both St. Peter and his successors.

[17] Quæ expositio falsa est. Primo, quia.—Bellarmin. *ibid.* § 1, 2. And he says it is false because the Parisians expounded it of the Church only. Volunt enim pro sola Ecclesia esse oratum. [For they declare the prayer was offered for the Church only.]

SECTION XXV.

it ought not to be alleged as proof of it, as here it is by A. C. The fourth place named by A. C. is St. John xiv. and the consequent place to it, St. John xvi. These places contain another promise of Christ concerning the coming of the Holy Ghost. Thus, "that the Comforter shall abide with them for ever"; that this Comforter is "the Spirit of truth"; and that this "Spirit of truth will lead them into all truth." Now this promise, as it is applied to the Church, consisting of all believers which are and have been since Christ appeared in the flesh, including the Apostles, is absolute, and without any restriction.[18] For the Holy Ghost did lead them into all truth, so that no error was to be found in that Church. But as it is appliable to the whole Church militant in all succeeding times, so the promise was made with a limitation,[19] namely, that the Blessed Spirit should abide with the Church for ever, and lead it into all truth: but not simply into all curious truth—no, not in or about the faith —but into all truth necessary to salvation. And against this truth the whole Catholic Church cannot err, keeping herself to the direction of the Scripture, as Christ hath appointed her. For in this very place where the promise is made, that the Holy Ghost "shall teach you all things," it is added, that "He shall bring all things to their remembrance." What? simply all things? No: but "all things which Christ had told them." So there is a limitation put upon the words by Christ Himself. And if the Church will not err, it must not ravell curiously into unnecessary

A. C. p. 57. John xiv. 16, 17.

John xvi. 13.

John xiv. 26.

[18] Field, *Of the Church*, book iv. chap. 2. [p. 392. Cambridge, 1849. "If we speak of the Church, as it comprehendeth the whole number of believers, that are, and have been since Christ appeared in the flesh, it is absolutely] free from all error and ignorance of divine things, [that are to be known by revelation. *Quid enim latuit Petrum*, etc. (lib. *de præscript hæret.*) For as Tertullian saith rightly and aptly to this purpose, What was hidden and concealed from Peter, upon whom Christ promised to build His Church, and to whom He gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven? from John the disciple He so dearly loved, which leaned on His breast at the mystical supper? and the rest of that blessed company? that should after be manifested to succeeding generations? So that touching the Church taken in this sort, there is no question, but it is absolutely led into the knowledge of all truth, without any mixture of ignorance, error, or danger of being deceived."]

[19] And Theodoret proceeds further, and says, Nec divini prophetæ, nec admirabiles Apostoli omnia præsciverunt. Quæcunque enim expediebant, ea illis significavit gratia Spiritus. [Οὔτε οἱ θεῖοι προφῆται, οὔτε οἱ θεοπέσιοι ἀπόστολοι πάντα προῄδεσαν· ὅσα γὰρ ἐλυσιτελεῖ, προεδήλου αὐτοῖς ἡ χάρις τοῦ πνεύματος. Neither the prophets of God, nor the inspired apostles foreknew everything. For everything that was important the grace of the Spirit made clear to them.]—Theodoret. [Episcop. Cyren.] in *1 Epist. ad. Timoth.* iii. 14, 15. [*Op.*, tom. iii. p. 477. ed. Paris. 1642.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

truths, which are out of the promise, nor follow any other guide than the doctrine which Christ hath left behind Him to govern it. For if it will come to the end, it must keep in the way. And Christ, Who promised the Spirit should lead, hath no where promised that it shall follow its leader, "into all truth," and[a] at least infallibly, unless you will limit, as before. So, no one of these places can make good A. C.'s assertion, "that the whole Church cannot err generally in any one point of divine truth." In absolute foundations she cannot:[20] in deductions and superstructures she may.

[a] ["not." Editt. 1673 and 1686.]

VI. Now, to all that I have said concerning the "right which particular Churches have to reform themselves, when the General Church cannot for impediments, or will not for negligence," which I have proved at large before,[21] all the answer that A. C. gives, is: First, *Quo judice?* "Who shall be judge?" And that shall be the Scripture and the primitive Church;[22] and by the rules of the one, and to the integrity of the other, both in faith and manners, any particular Church may safely reform itself.

A. C. p. 57.

VII. Secondly, "That no reformation in faith can be needful in the General Church, but only in particular Churches. In which case also," he saith, "particular Churches may not take upon them to judge and condemn others of errors in faith." Well, how far forth reformation even of faith may be necessary in the General Church, I have expressed already.[23] And for particular Churches, I do not say, "that they must take upon them to judge or condemn others of error in faith." That which I say, is "They may reform themselves." Now I hope, "to reform themselves," and "to condemn others," are two different works; unless it fall out so, that by reforming themselves, they do by consequence condemn any other, that is guilty in that

A. C. p. 58.

[20] Sect. xxi. No. 5. [*ubi sup.* p. 159.]

[21] Sect. xxiv. No. 1, 2, etc. [*ubi sup.* pp. 168 and 169.]

[22] Si de [aliqua] modica quæstione disceptatio esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas recurrere ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli conversati sunt, et ab eis de præsenti quæstione sumere quod certum et [re] liquidum est? Quid autum si neque Apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, [quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant Ecclesias? If there were a dispute on some small matter, would it not be the right way to go to the most ancient Churches, in which the Apostles lived, and to get from them what was sure and clear as to the matter in hand? And what would happen if the Apostles had not left us the Scriptures; would it not have been our duty to follow the order of the tradition which they gave to those to whom they entrusted the charge of the Churches?]—S. Irenæus, *contra Hæreses*, lib. iii. cap. 4. [*Op.*, p. 205. ed. Grabe. Migne, vii. 855.]

[23] Sect. xxv. No. 4. [*ubi sup.* p. 185.]

point in which they reform themselves; and so far to judge and condemn others, is not only lawful, but necessary. A man that lives religiously, doth not by and by sit in judgment, and condemn with his mouth all profane livers; but yet, while he is silent, his very life condemns them. And I hope, in this way of judicature, A. C. dares not say it is unlawful for a particular Church or man to condemn another. And further, whatsoever A. C. can say to the contrary, there are divers cases, where heresies are known and notorious, in which it will be hard to say (as he doth), That one particular Church must not judge or condemn another, so far forth, at least, as to abhor and protest against the heresy of it.

Section XXV.

A. C. p. 58.

VIII. Thirdly, If one particular Church may not judge or condemn another, what must then be done, where particulars need reformation? What? Why then A. C. tells us: "That particular Churches must in that case, as Irenæus intimateth, have recourse to the Church of Rome, which hath more powerful principality, and to her bishop,[24] who is chief pastor of the whole Church, as being St. Peter's successor, 'to whom Christ promised the keys,' for whom He prayed that 'his faith might not fail,' and whom He charged to 'feed and govern the whole flock.' And this," A. C. tells us, "he shall never refuse to do in such sort, as that this neglect shall be a just cause for any particular man or Church, under pretence of reformation in manners or faith, to make a schism or separation from the whole general Church."

A. C. p. 58.

Matt. xvi.

Luke xxii.

John xxi.

IX. Well, first you see where A. C. would have us. "If any particular Churches differ in points of divine truth, they must not judge or condemn each other," saith he. No, take heed of that in any case; that is the office of the universal Church. And yet he will have it, "That Rome, which is but a particular Church, must and ought judge all other particulars."

X. Secondly, he tells us this is so, "Because the Church of Rome hath more powerful principality than other particular Churches, and that her bishop is pastor of the whole Church." To this I answer, that it is most true indeed; the Church of Rome hath had, and hath yet, "more powerful principality" than any other particular Church: but she hath not this power from Christ. The Roman patriarch, by ecclesiastical constitutions, might perhaps have a primacy of order; but for principality

[24] And after he saith, p. 58. "That the Bishop of Rome is, and ought to be, the judge of particular Churches in this case."

[CHAPTER VIII.]

of power, the patriarchs were as even, as equal, as the Apostles[25] were before them. The truth is, this "more powerful principality" the Roman bishops[26] got under the emperors, after they became Christian; and they used the matter so, that they grew big enough to oppose, nay to depose, the emperors, by the same power which they had given them. And after this, other particular Churches, especially here in the West, submitted themselves to them for succour and protection's sake. And this was one main cause which swelled Rome into this "more powerful principality," and not any right given by Christ to make that prelate[27] pastor of the whole Church. I know Bellarmine makes much ado about it, and will needs fetch it out of St. Augustine,[28] who says indeed, "That in the Church of Rome there did always flourish the principality of an apostolic chair"; or, if you will, the apostolic chair in relation to the West and South parts of the Church, all the other four apostolic chairs being in the East. Now, this no man denies, that understands the state and story of the Church; and Calvin[29] confesses it expressly.

[25] [Si quidem] summa potestas ecclesiastica non solum data est Petro, sed etiam aliis Apostolis: omnes enim poterant dicere illud S. Pauli, [Instantia mea quotidiana,] sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum, *2 Cor.* xi. 28. [If the highest power in the Church was given not only to Peter; but also to the other Apostles; for all could say with St. Paul, "that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the Churches."]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. i. cap. 9. [§ 45. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 537. D.] Where then is the difference between St. Peter and the rest? In this, saith Bellarmine, (*Ibid.*) Sed Petro data est summa potestas ecclesiastica ut ordinario pastori, cui perpetuo succederetur; aliis vero, tanquam delegatis, quibus non succederetur. [But to St. Peter was given the highest power in the Church, as to an ordinary Pastor who would have continuous successors, but to the others it was given as to delegates who would have no successors.]—This is handsomely said to men easy of belief. But that the highest power ecclesiastical, confessed to be given to the other Apostles as well as to St. Peter, was given to St. Peter only, as to an ordinary Pastor, whose successors should have the same power, which the successors of the rest should not have, can never be proved out of Scripture. Nay, (I will give them their own latitude,) it can never be proved by any tradition of the whole Catholic Church. And till it be proved, Bellarmine's handsome expression cannot be believed by me; for St. Cyprian hath told me long since, that Episcopatus unus est [the Episcopate is one] (for as much as belongs to the calling,) as well as Apostolatus.—Lib. *de simplicit. prælatorum.*—[St. Cyprian's words are: Episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum. One Episcopate consisting of many Bishops.—S. Cyprian. *Epist.* lii. ad Antonianum, *Op.*, p. 73. ed. Benedict.]

[26] Sect. xxv. No. 12. [*vide infra.* p. 200.]

[27] [Bellarmin.] *de Rom. Pont.* lib. i. cap. ix. § 46. [col. 538. B. *ubi sup.* note 25.]

[28] Romanæ Ecclesiæ, in qua semper Apostolicæ Cathedræ viguit principatus.—S. Augustin. *Epist.* clxii. [*Epist.* xliii. ad Glorium et Eleusium, etc. cap. 3 *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 91. E. Migne, ii. 163.]

[29] Opinio [enim illa, quæ nescio quomodo] invaluerat, fundatam [et constitutam] eam fuisse Ecclesiam

Nor is the word *principatus* so great, nor were the bishops of those times so little, as that *principes* and *principatus* are not commonly given them, both by the Greek[30] and the Latin Fathers of this great and learnedest age of the Church, made up of the fourth and fifth hundred years; always understanding *principatus* of their spiritual power, and within the limits of their several jurisdictions, which perhaps now and then they did occasionally exceed. And there is not one word in St. Augustine, "That this principality of the Apostolic chair in the Church of Rome was then, or ought to be now, exercised over the whole Church of Christ," as Bellarmine insinuates there, and as A. C. would have it here. And to prove that St. Augustine did not intend by *principatus* here, to give the Roman bishop any power out of his own limits, (which God knows were far short of the whole Church,) I shall make it most manifest out of the very same epistle. "For afterwards," saith St. Augustine, "when the pertinacy of the Donatists could not be restrained by the African bishops only,[31] they gave them leave to be heard by foreign bishops." And after that he hath these words: "And

SECTION XXV.

Petri ministerio, [ad conciliandam gratiam et auctoritatem plurimum valebat;] itaque in occidente sedes Apostolica, honoris causa, vocabatur. [For that opinion, which had gained strength somehow, that the Church of Rome was founded and ordered by the work of Peter, had great effect in gaining it favour and authority; and so it came to be called in the West, out of respect, the Apostolic See.]—Calvin. *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 6. § 16. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 298.]

[30] S. Hilar. *de Trinitate*, lib. viii. [in] princip. [cap. i. *Op.*, col. 947. B. ed. Benedict. Migne, ii. 236.] And he speaks of a bishop in general. [The chapter is on Bishops' qualifications.]—Ascribuntur episcopo *δυναστεία, βήμα καὶ ἀρχή*, imperium, thronus, et principatus ad regimen animarum. [There are given to the Bishop authority, a seat of judgment, and a right of government for the conduct of souls.]—Vide Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xvii. [*Καὶ ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ νόμος ὑποτίθησιν ὑμᾶς τῇ ἐμῇ δυναστείᾳ καὶ τῷ ἐμῷ βήματι· ἄρχομεν γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί· προσθήσω δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὴν μείζονα καὶ τελεωτέραν ἀρχήν·* And the law of Christ puts you under my authority and my seat of judgment; for we also govern; and I will add further it is a greater and better government.—St. Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xvii. (ad cives Nazianzenos), cap. 8. *Op.*, tom. i. pp. 322, 323. E. A. ed. Benedict.] A government of this sort.—Et, *τοιαύτη ἀρχή* [such a government], hujusmodi imperium. And he also speaks of a bishop.—*Id. Orat.* xx. [al. xliii. (*Orat. Funeb.* in S. Basil.) cap. 38. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 800. B.] Nor were these any titles of pride in bishops then. For St. Greg. Nazianz. who challenges these titles to himself, *Orat.* xvii. was so devout, so mild, and so humble, that rather than the peace of the Church should be broken, he freely resigned the great patriarchate of Constantinople, and retired; and this in the First Council of Constantinople, and the Second General.

[31] Pergant ad fratres et collegas nostros transmarinarum ecclesiarum episcopos. [That they might go to our brothers and colleagues, the bishops of over-sea churches.]—S. Augustin. *Epist.* clxii. [*Epist.* xliii. cap. 4, col. 92. B. Migne, ii. 163.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

yet peradventure Melchiades, the bishop of the Roman Church, with his colleagues, the transmarine bishops, *non debuit*, ought not usurp to himself this judgment, which was determined by seventy African bishops, Tigisitanus sitting primate. And what will you say if he did not usurp this power? For the emperor, being desired, sent bishops judges, which should sit with him, and determine what was just upon the whole cause."[32] In which passage there are very many things observable: As first, that the Roman prelate came not in, till there was leave for them to go to "transmarine bishops." Secondly, that if the pope had come in without this leave, it had been an "usurpation." Thirdly, that when he did thus come in, not by his own proper authority but by leave, there were other bishops made "judges with him." Fourthly, that these other bishops were "appointed and sent by the emperor," and his power; that which the pope will least of all endure. Lastly, lest the pope and his adherents should say this was an usurpation in the emperor, St. Augustine[33] tells us a little before, in the same epistle still, "that this doth chiefly belong *ad curam ejus*, to the emperor's care and charge, and that he is to give an account to God for it." And Melchiades did sit and judge the business with all Christian prudence and moderation. So at this time the Roman prelate was not received as pastor of the whole Church, say A. C. what he please. Nor had he any supremacy over the other patriarchs; and for this, were all other records of antiquity silent, the civil law is proof enough, and that is a monument of the primitive Church. The text there is: *A patriarcha non datur appellatio*,[34]

[32] An forte non debuit Romanæ ecclesiæ Melchiades episcopus cum collegis transmarinis episcopis illud sibi usurpare judicium, quod ab Afris septuaginta, ubi primas Tigisitanus præsedit, fuerat terminatum? Quid quod nec ipse usurpavit? Rogatus quippe Imperator, judices misit episcopos, qui cum eo sederent, et de tota illa causa, quod justum videretur, statuerent.—S. Augustin. *Ibid.* [cap. 5. col. 94. D. Migne, ii. 166.]

[33] Ad cujus curam, de qua rationem Deo redditurus est, res illa maxime pertinebat.—S. Augustin. *Epist.* clxii. [cap. 4. col. 93. G. Migne, ii. 165.]

[34] Nam contra horum antistitum (de patriarchis loquitur) sententias, non esse locum appellationi a majoribus nostris constitutum est.—*Cod.* [*Justiniani*,] lib. i. tit. iv. l. 29. ex editione Gothofredi. [*κατὰ γὰρ δὴ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπισκόπων ἀποφάσεων οὐκ εἶναι χώραν ἐκκλήτῳ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν νενομοθέτηται·* For against the decisions of bishops of that dignity there was no appeal allowed by our lawgivers.—p. 29. ed. Van Leeuwen. Amstel. 1663.]—[Et] si non rata habuerit utraque pars quæ judicata sunt, tunc beatissimus patriarcha diœceseos illius, inter eos audiat, [et illa determinet quæ ecclesiasticis canonibus et legibus consonant:] nulla parte ejus sententiæ contradicere valente.—*Authen. Collat.* ix. tit. xv. [vi.] cap. 22. [Si quis vero, *Novell. Justiniani*, cxxiii. p. 173. ed. Van Leeuwen.

"From a patriarch there lies no appeal." No appeal. Therefore every patriarch was alike supreme in his own patriarchate. Therefore the pope then had no supremacy over the whole Church. Therefore certainly not then received as universal pastor. And St. Gregory[35] himself, speaking of appeals, and expressly citing the laws themselves, says plainly: "That the patriarch is to put a final end to those causes, which come before him by appeal from bishops and archbishops";[36] but then he adds, "That where there is no metropolitan nor patriarch of that diocese, there they are to have recourse to the see apostolic, as being the head of all Churches."[37] Where first this implies plainly, That if there be a metropolitan or a patriarch in those Churches, his judgment is final; and there ought to be no appeal to Rome. Secondly, it is as plain, that in those ancient times of the Church Government, Britain was never subject to the see of Rome. For it was one of the six dioceses[38] of the West Empire, and had a primate of its own: Nay, John Capgrave,[39] one of your own, and learned for those times,

Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐμμείνῃ ἑκάτερον μέρος τοῖς κεκριμένοις, τηνικαῦτα, ὁ μακαριώτατος πατριάρχης ἐκείνης τῆς διοικήσεως μεταξὺ αὐτῶν ἀκροάσθω, κἀκεῖνα ὁριζέτω, ἅτινα τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς κανόσι καὶ τοῖς νόμοις συνᾴδει· οὐδενὸς μέρους κατὰ τῆς ψήφου αὐτοῦ ἀντιλέγειν δυναμένου· And if either party did not accept the decisions given, then the most reverend Patriarch of that diocese is to hear both sides, and is to determine what is agreeable to the canons and laws of the Church; and neither side is to be allowed to reject his decision.]

[35] Pope, 590-604.

[36] Et ille (scil. Patriarcha) secundum canones et leges [huic] præbeat finem. (And there he cites the *Novell* itself: [viz. *Auth. Coll.* ix. tit. vi. cap. 22. Si quis vero, *Novell. Justiniani*, cxxiii. p. 173. ed. Van Leeuwen.)—apud] S. Gregor [Magn. *Registri Epistolar.*] lib. xiii. Indict. 6. *Epist.* xlv. (al. lvi.) [seu Capitulare ii. Imperial. Johann. defensori. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1254. A. B. ed. Benedict. Migne, iii. 1294.]

[37] [Contra hæc] si dictum fuerit, quia nec Metropolitanum habeat, nec Patriarcham, dicendum est, quia a sede apostolica, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum caput est, causa [hæc] audienda. —S. Gregor. [Magn.] *Ibid.* [col. 1254. B.]

[38] *Notitia provinciarum occidentalium* per Guidum Pancirollum, lib. ii. cap. 48. [p. 149. ed. Lugd. 1608. This statement of Pancirollus refers only to the civil and military divisions of the empire, and not, as it appears, to any ecclesiastical dignities. The six Vicars of the Western Empire were, Urbis Romæ, Italiæ, Africæ, Hispaniæ, Galliæ, Britanniarum.]

[39] Illum cunctis liberalium artium disciplinis eruditum pro magistro teneamus, et quasi comparem, velut alterius orbis Apostolicum et Patriarcham. [Let us treat him since he is a man learned in all the learning of liberal arts, as our master, and as an equal, as if he were the Patriarch and Apostolic ruler of a second world.]—Joann. Capgrav. *de vitis Sanctorum*, in vita S. Anselmi: [*Nova legenda Angliæ*, fol. xix. verso, col. 1, 2. ed. Wynkyn de Worde, 1516.]—Et, Guil. Malmesburiens. *de Gestis Pontificum Anglor.* [lib. i.] p. 223. ed. Francof, 1601. [apud *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores*, p. 127. ed. Savile, Londin. 1596. Ut ergo ventum ad concilium est . . . exciderat animo summi pontificis, ingruente tumultu, ut ei (sc. Anselmo,) locum delegaret. Sed erroris admoni-

[CHAPTER VIII.] and long before him William of Malmesbury, tell us, "That Pope Urban the Second, at the Council held at Bari[40] in Apulia, accounted my worthy predecessor St. Anselm as his own compeer, and said, he was as the apostolic and patriarch of the other world." (So he then termed this island.) Now, the Britons having a primate of their own (which is greater than a metropolitan), yea, a patriarch,[41] if you will, he could not be appealed from to Rome, by St. Gregory's own doctrine. Thirdly, it will be hard for any man to prove there were any Churches then in the world, which were not under some, either patriarch or metropolitan. Fourthly, if any such were, it is *gratis dictum*, and impossible to be proved, that all such Churches, wherever seated in the world, were obliged to depend on Rome. For manifest it is, that the bishops which were ordained in places without the limits of the Roman Empire, which places they commonly called barbarous,[42] were all to be ordained,—and

tus est . . . et Anselmi recordatus exclamat . . . Pater et Magister Anselme Anglorum archiepiscope ubi es? Ille ubi se vocari audivit, in pedes constitit. Quem apostolicus compellans, Nunc, inquit, magister opus est scientia, opus eloquentiæ tuæ opera: veni, ascende huc, et defende matrem tuam ecclesiam, quam Græci labefactare conantur: succurre ergo quasi a Deo huc missus. Continuo cuncti astantes, et assidentes oculos et ora in eum conversi, percunctari quis esset, annitentibusque proximis ad consessum apostolici levatus, sedere jussus juxta Romanum archidiaconum, cui ante papam sedere moris est. Includamus, inquit, hunc in orbe nostro, quasi alterius orbis Papam. When therefore they came to the Council, the chief Pontiff had forgotten, in the tumult which accompanied their entrance, to appoint a place for Anselm. When his mistake was pointed out he said, Father and Teacher, Anselm, Archbishop of the English, where are you? And when Anselm heard himself called he stood upon his feet. Then the Apostolic Bishop addressed him and said: Now, Teacher, we have need of knowledge; we have need of the help of your eloquence; come, mount up here, and defend your Mother Church, which the Greeks are labouring to overthrow; come to her help, therefore, as sent hither by God. And as all kept standing and fixing their eyes and turning their faces to find out who he was, he was raised by the help of those nearest him to the level of those who sat round the Apostolic Bishop, and was bidden to sit next to the Archdeacon of Rome, who has the right to sit before the Pope. Let us include him, said the Pope, in our World, as Pope of a second World.]

[40] Held in 1098.

[41] Ibi (Cantuariæ, *i.e.*) prima sedes archiepiscopi habetur, qui est totius Angliæ Primas et Patriarcha. [Here, at Canterbury, is placed the chief seat of the Archbishop, who is Primate and Patriarch of all England.]—Guil. Malmesburiensis in Prolog. lib. i. *de Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, p. 195. [p. 111. ed. Londin. 1596.]

[42] Præterea et qui sunt *ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς*, in barbarico, Episcopi [prædictarum diœceseon] ordinentur a sanctissimo throno sanctissimæ Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ. [*ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς ἐπισκόπους τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων χειροτονεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ προειρημένου ἁγιωτάτου θρόνου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας.* Besides, as for these who are to be Bishops in the Barbarian countries over the forenamed dioceses (the diocese was a division of the Roman Empire), they are to be

therefore, most probable, to be governed,—by the patriarch of Constantinople. And for Rome's being the head of all Churches, I have said enough to that in divers parts of this discourse.

XI. And since I am thus fallen upon the Church of Africa, I shall borrow another reason from the practice of that Church, why, by *principatus*, St. Augustine neither did nor could mean any principality of the Church, or Bishop of Rome over the whole Church of Christ. For as the acts of Councils and stories go, the African prelates, finding that all succeeding popes were not of Melchiades' temper, set themselves to assert their own liberties, and held it out stoutly against Zosimus, Boniface the First, and Celestine the First, who were successively popes of Rome.[43] At last it was concluded in the sixth Council of Carthage,[44] wherein were assembled two hundred and seventeen bishops, of which St. Augustine himself was one, that they would not give way to such a manifest encroachment upon their rights and liberties, and thereupon gave present notice to Pope Celestine to forbear sending his officers amongst them, "lest he should seem to induce the swelling pride of the world into the Church of Christ."[45] And this is said to have amounted into a formal separation from the Church of Rome, and to have continued for the space of somewhat more than one hundred years. Now, that such a separation there was of the African Church from Rome, and a reconciliation after, stands upon the credit and authority of two public instruments, extant both among the ancient Councils. The one is an Epistle from Boniface the Second,[46] in whose time the reconciliation to Rome is said to be made by Eulalius, then bishop of Carthage; but the separation, *instigante diabolo*, by the "temptation of the devil."[47] The other is an *Exemplar Precum*, or copy of the petition of the same Eulalius, in which he damns and curses all those his predecessors which went against the

ordained by the forenamed most holy See of the most holy Church in Constantinople.]—*Codex Canonum ecclesiæ universæ*, Can. ccvi. [apud *Biblioth. Juris Canonici Veteris*, Justelli, p. 67. ed. Paris. 1661.] And Justellus proves it there at large, that by *in barbarico*, in that Canon, is meant, *in solo barbarorum* [on the territory of Barbarians.]—Annot. *Ibid.* [pp. 94, 95.]

[43] From 417-432.

[44] Held in 425.

[45] Ne fumosum typhum sæculi in Ecclesiam Christi, videamur inducere, etc.—*Epist. Conc. Afric. ad Papam.* [*S.*] *Cælestinum primum*: apud Nicolin. tom. i. *Concil.* p. 844. *Concil.* tom. ii. col. 1676. A.]

[46] Pope, 530-1.

[47] *Epist. Bonifacii II.*: [de reconciliatione Carthaginensis ecclesiæ,] apud Nicolin. tom. ii. *Concil.* p. 544. —[*Concil.* tom. iv. col. 1684.]

[CHAPTER VIII.] Church of Rome.[48] Amongst which, Eulalius must needs curse St. Augustine; and Pope Boniface accepting this submission must acknowledge that St. Augustine and the rest of that Council deserved this curse, and died under it, as violating *rectæ fidei regulam*, "the rule of the right faith,"—so the *Exemplar Precum* begins—by refusing the Pope's authority. I will not deny but that there are divers reasons given by the learned Romanists and Reformed writers for and against the truth and authority of both these instruments. But because this is too long to be examined here, I will say but this, and then make my use of it to my present purpose, giving the Church of Rome free leave to acknowledge these instruments to be true, or false, as they please. That which I shall say is this: These instruments are let stand in all editions of the Councils and Epistles Decretal; as, for example, in the old edition by Isidore, anno 1524; and in another old edition of them, printed anno 1530; and in that which was published by P. Crabbe, anno 1538; and in the edition of Valentinus Joverius, anno 1555; and in that by Surius, anno 1567; and in the edition at Venice by Nicolinus, anno 1585; and in all of these without any note or censure upon them. And they are in the edition of Binius too, anno 1618; but there is a censure upon them to keep a quarter, it may be, with Baronius,[49] who was the first, I think, that ever quarrelled them, and he doth it tartly. And since, Bellarmine[50] follows the same way, but more doubtfully. This is that which I had to say: and the use which I shall make of these instruments, whether they be true or false, is this: They are either true or false, that is of necessity. If they be false, then Boniface the Second, and his accomplices at Rome, or some for them, are notorious forgers, and that of records of great consequence concerning the government and peace of the whole Church of Christ, and to the perpetual infamy of that see; and all this foolishly and to no purpose. For if there were no such separation, as these records mention, of the African Churches from the Roman, to what end should Boniface or any other counterfeit an epistle of

[48] *Exemp. Precum*: apud Nicolin. *Ibid.* p. 545.—[*Concil.* tom. iv. col. 1686.]

[49] Baronius, *Annal.* ad Ann. 419. No. [92,] 93, 94.

[50] Valde mihi eas Epistolas esse suspectas. [I gravely suspect those letters.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. ii. cap. 25. [§ 46. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 685. D.]—Sed si forte illæ Epistolæ veræ sunt, nihil enim affirmo, [sine dubio non in eum sensum accipiendæ sunt, etc. But if those letters happen to be genuine, for I come to no decision on the subject, certainly they must not be taken in that sense.]—*Ibid.* § ult. [col. 686. A.]

his own, and a submission of Eulalius? On the other side, if these instruments be true, as the sixth Council of Carthage against all other arguments makes me incline to believe they are—in substance at least, though perhaps not in all circumstances—then it is manifest that the Church of Africa separated from the Church of Rome; that this separation continued above one hundred years; that the Church of Africa made this separation in a National Council of their own, which had in it two hundred and seventeen bishops; that this separation was made, for aught appears, only because they at Rome were too ready to entertain appeals from the Church of Africa, as appears in the case of Apiarius,[51] who then appealed thither; that St. Augustine, Eugenius, Fulgentius, and all those bishops and other martyrs which suffered in the Vandalic persecution,[52] died in the time of this separation; that if this separation were not just, but a schism, then these famous fathers of the Church died, for aught appears, in actual and unrepented schism,[53] and out of the Church. And if so, then how comes St. Augustine to be, and be accounted, a saint, all over the Christian world, and at Rome itself? But if the separation were just, then is it far more lawful for the Church of England, by a National Council, to cast off the Pope's usurpation, as she did,[54] than it was for the African Church to separate; because then the African Church excepted only against the pride of Rome[55] in case of appeals, and two other canons less material; but the Church of England excepts, besides this grievance, against many corruptions in doctrine belonging to the faith, with which Rome at that time of the African separation was not tainted.

[51] And so the Council of Carthage sent word to Pope Celestine plainly, that in admitting such appeals, he brake the decrees of the Council of Nice.—*Epist. Concil. Africani ad Cælestinum*, cap. cv. apud Nicolin. tom. i. *Concil.* p. 844. [*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 1675.]

[52] The Vandals conquered Africa 429-30 A.D.

[53] [Nisi ea epistola falsa omnino esse convinci posset,] plane ex ecclesiæ Catholicæ albo expungenda fuissent sanctorum Africanorum martyrum agmina, qui in persecutione Vandalica pro fide Catholica [magna gloria certantes . . . assecuti sunt martyrii palmam. Unless that letter can be shown to be altogether false, evidently we must expunge from the list of the Catholic Church the bands of holy African martyrs who obtained the palm of martyrdom, contending with great glory for the Catholic faith during the Vandal persecution.—Baron. *Annal.* ad Ann. 419. No. 93.—Et, Binius in notis *ad Epist. Bonifacii II. ad Eulalium*, [his verbis: sc. Quæ omnia commentitia sunt et notorie falsa. Which are all lying and notorious forgeries.—*Concil.* tom. iv. col. 1685.]

[54] Sect. xxiv. No. 5. [*ubi sup.* p. 174.]

[55] [Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pontif.* lib. ii. cap. 25. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 679. A.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

A. C. p. 58.

And I am out of all doubt, that St. Augustine, and those other famous men in their generations, durst not thus have separated from Rome, had the Pope had "that powerful principality over the whole Church of Christ, and that by Christ's own ordinance," and institution, as A. C. pretends he had.

XII. I told you a little before,[56] that the popes grew under the emperors till they had overgrown them. And now lest A. C. should say I speak it without proof, I will give you a brief touch of the Church story in that behalf, and that from the beginning of the emperors becoming Christians to the time of Charles the Great, which contains about five hundred years; for so soon as the emperors became Christian, the Church, which before was kept under by persecutions, began to be put in better order. For the calling and authority of bishops over the inferior clergy, that was "a thing of known use and benefit for preservation of unity and peace in the Church." And so much St. Jerome[57] tells us; though, being none himself, he was no great friend to bishops. And this was so settled in the minds of men from the very infancy of the Christian Church, as that it had not been to that

[56] Sect. xxv. No. 10. [*ubi sup.* p. 192.]

[57] Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est; ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumperet. Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista, [usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos,] presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant. [But afterwards one of them was selected to be chief over the rest; and this was done to prevent schism, lest some one should draw to himself the Church of Christ and break it asunder. For besides, at Alexandria by the arrangement of Mark the Evangelist, up to the Episcopate of Heracles and Dionysius, the priests always chose one of their number, set him in a higher place and called him Bishop.]—S. Hieron. in *Epist. ad Evagrium*, [al. Evangelum, *Op.*, tom. iv. par. 2. col. 803.] So even according to St. Jerome, bishops had a very ancient and honourable descent in the Church from St. Mark the Evangelist. And about the end of the same Epistle he acknowledges it, traditionem esse apostolicam, [in these words: Et ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas sumtas de veteri Testamento, quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi episcopi et presbyteri et diaconi vindicent in Ecclesia. And that we may know the Apostolic traditions to be taken from the Old Testament; for what Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the temple, this the bishops and priests and deacons should claim in the Church.—*ibid.*] Nay more than so, he affirms plainly, that ubi non est sacerdos non est Ecclesia [in these words: Ecclesia autem non est, quæ non habet sacerdotes. It is no Church, if it has no Bishops.]—St. Hieron. *adv. Luciferianos*, [*Op.*, tom. iv. par. 2. col. 302.] And in that place most manifest it is that St. Jerome by sacerdos means a bishop. For he speaks de sacerdote qui potestatem habet ordinandi, which, in St. Jerome's own judgment, no mere priest had, but a bishop only. [Quid enim facit excepta ordinatione episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat? For what does a Bishop do which a priest does not do except ordain?]—S. Hieron. *Epist. ad Evagrium* [al. Evangelum, *ut sup.*]. So even with him, no bishop, and no Church.

time contradicted by any. So that then there was no controversy about the calling; all agreed upon that; the only difficulty was to accommodate the places and precedencies of bishops among themselves, for the very necessity of order and government. To do this, the most equal and impartial way was, that "as the Church is in the commonwealth, not the commonwealth in it," as Optatus tells us,[58] so the honours of the Church should follow the honours of the state. And so it was insinuated, if not ordered, as appears by the canons of the Councils of Chalcedon[59] and Antioch.[60] And this was the very fountain of papal greatness, the pope having his residence in the great imperial city. But precedency is one thing, and authority is another. It was thought fit, therefore—though, as St. Cyprian speaks, *episcopatus unus est*,[61] "the calling of a bishop be one and the same,"—that yet among bishops there should be a certain subordination and subjection. The empire, therefore, being cast into several divisions, which they then call dioceses, every diocese contained several provinces, every province several bishoprics. The chief of a diocese, in that larger sense, was called ἔξαρχος, and sometimes a Patriarch; the chief of a province, a Metropolitan. (Next, the bishops in their several dioceses, as we now use that word.) Among these there was effectual subjection, respectively grounded upon canon and positive law, in their several quarters; but over them none at all: all the difference there was but honorary, not authoritative. If the ambition of some particular persons did attempt now and then to break these bounds, it is no marvel; for no calling can sanctify all that have it. And Socrates tells us,

[58] Non enim respublica est in Ecclesia: sed Ecclesia in republica [est, id est, in imperio Romano.]—S. Optat. [Milevit. *de schism. Donatist.*] lib. iii. [cap. 3. *Op.*, p. 52. ed. Dupin.]

[59] Concil. Chalcedon, [A.D. 451.] can. ix. et Actio xvi. [Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα· καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ρν'. θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι, τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες τὴν βασιλείᾳ καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, κ.τ.λ. For also the throne of the elder Rome, because the City was the Capital of the World, reasonably received special privileges from our elders. And moved by the same cause, the 150 bishops, most dear to God, allotted the same privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome, rightly judging that the city which was honoured by the royal residence and the legislative body, and also enjoyed equal privileges with the elder royal Rome should enjoy the like in ecclesiastical matters.—*Concil.* tom. iv. col. 795. E.]

[60] 471 A.D.

[61] S. Cyprian lib. *de simplicit. prælatorum*, [*i.e.* in. *Epist. ubi sup.* p. 192. note 25.]

[CHAPTER VIII.] that in this way the bishops of Alexandria and Rome advanced themselves to a great height, πέρα τῆς ἱερωσύνης,[62] "even beyond the quality of bishops." Now, upon view of story, it will appear, that what advantage accrued to Alexandria, was gotten by the violence of Theophilus,[63] patriarch there, a man of exceeding great learning, and of no less violence; and he made no little advantage out of this, that the Empress Eudoxia[64] used his help for the casting of St. Chrysostom out of Constantinople. But the Roman prelates grew, by a steady and constant watchfulness upon all occasions, to increase the honour of that see; interposing and assuming to themselves to be *vindices canonum*,[65] as St. Gregory Naz[ianzen] speaks, "defenders and restorers of the canons of the Church"; which was a fair pretence, and took extremely well. But yet the world took notice of this their aim. For, in all contestations between the East and the West, which were nor small nor few, "the Western bishops objected levity to the Eastern, and they again arrogancy to the bishops of the West," as Billius[66] observes, and upon very warrantable testimonies. For all this, the bishop of Rome continued in good obedience to the

[62] [Thorold (T. C., *Laud's Labyrinth*, p. 193) complains of Laud citing these "three Greek words out of Socrates" without any reference. He supplies them from Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. cap. 11 (apud *Hist. Eccl. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 356. ed. Reading.) and observes that "such a place clearly shows, not only that Socrates was an enemy of the Roman Church, but a favourer of heretics, as divers good authors charge him." The passage from Socrates is: Ἄχρι γὰρ τούτου, Ναυατιανοὶ μεγάλως ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ἤνθησαν, ἐκκλησίας πλείστας ἔχοντες, καὶ λαὸν πολὺν συναθροίζοντες· ἀλλ' ὁ φθόνος καὶ τούτων ἥψατο, τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκοπῆς ὁμοίως τῇ Ἀλεξανδρέων πέρα τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐπὶ δυναστείαν ἤδη πάλαι προελθούσης. For up till now the Novatians were numerous in Rome, and held most of the Churches, and collected large congregations; but envy also affected them, since the Bishop of Rome, like the Bishop of Alexandria, advanced already beyond the quality of Bishops to supremacy in government.]

[63] [Patriarch of Alexandria, 385-412 A.D.]

[64] [Wife of Arcadius, Emperor of the East, 395-408 A.D.]

[65] Ὡς λέγουσι, (ut aiunt, sive se jactant esse.) [As they call themselves or boast to be.]—S. Greg. Nazianz. *Carmen de vita sua*, [1611—1615. tom. ii.] p. 26. [ed. Billii. Paris. 1630. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 758. ed. Benedict.]

[66] [Φυσῶντες ἡμῖν ἐσπέριόν τε καὶ τραχύ.
With their proud rough western manners. (S. Greg. Nazianz. *ubi sup.* 1. 1802.) His verbis] Occidentales acerbitatis et insolentiæ [notat:] quemadmodum etiam Basilius [in epistola quadam fastus eos atque arrogantiæ insimulat, τί δεῖ ἡμῶν τῆς δυτικῆς ὀφρύος;] (Quid opus est Occidentali supercilio?) [inquiens. At contra] Orientalibus levitas [fere semper ab Occidentalibus] objecta est. [With these words he marks the roughness and rudeness of the Western Bishops. In like manner St. Basil in one of his letters charges them with pride and arrogance saying, "What need have we of the Westerns' haughtiness?" But on the other hand the Westerns accuse the Easterns almost always of levity.]—Billius, *Scholia in vit. S. Greg. Nasians.* No. 153. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1343. ed. 1630.]

emperor, enduring his censures and judgments. And being chosen by the clergy and people of Rome, he accepted from the emperor the ratification of that choice; insomuch, that about the year 579, when all Italy was on fire with the Lombards, and Pelagius the Second[67] constrained through the necessity of the times, contrary to the example of his predecessors, to enter upon the popedom without the emperor's leave, St. Gregory, then a deacon, was shortly after sent on embassy to excuse it. About this time brake out the ambition of John,[68] patriarch of Constantinople, affecting to be universal bishop; he was countenanced in this by Mauricius the emperor, but sorely opposed by Pelagius and St. Gregory; insomuch that St. Gregory says plainly, "that this pride of his shows that the times of antichrist were near."[69] So, as yet—and this was now upon the point of six hundred years after Christ—there was no universal bishop—no one monarch over the whole militant Church. But Mauricius being deposed and murdered by Phocas, Phocas conferred upon Boniface the Third[70] [A.D. 605] that very honour, which two of his predecessors

[67] [Pope, 578-590 A.D.]
Hæc [autem] una fuit causa, quare Pelagius injussu principis [tum] pontifex creatus sit, cum extra obsessam ab hoste urbem mitti quispiam non posset. [Nil enim tum a clero in eligendo pontifice actum erat, nisi ejus electionem imperator approbasset. Missus] itaque [Constantinopolim] ad placandum imperatorem Gregorius diaconus, etc. [But this was one of the reasons why Pelagius was created Pope without the Emperor's order, since no one could be sent to get it from a City which was blockaded by an enemy. Else they would have asked him; for at that time the Clergy did nothing in the choice of a Pope, unless the Emperor approved his election. And so Gregory the Deacon was sent to Constantinople to appease the Emperor.]—Platina, in *vita Pelagii II.* [*Vitæ Pontificum*, p. 81. ed. Colon. 1568.]—Et, Onuphrius, [*Annotat.*] *ibidem* [p. 82].

[68] [Patriarch, 582-595 A.D.]
Onuphrius. [*Annotat.*] in Platin. in *vit. Bonifac. III.* [p. 87].

[69] In hac ejus superbia quid aliud nisi propinqua jam Antichristi esse tempora designatur? — S. Gregor. [Magn. *Registri*] *Epistol.* lib. iv. Epist. 78. [lib. v. Indict. xiii. *Epist.* xxi. (al. xxxiv.) ad Constantinam Augustam, *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 751. C. Migne, iii. 749.]

[70] It may be they will say St. Gregory did not inveigh against the thing, but the person: that John of Constantinople should take that upon him which belonged to the pope. But it is manifest by St. Gregory's own text, that he speaks against the thing itself, that neither the Bishop of Rome, nor any other, ought to take on him that title. [Cunctis enim evangelium scientibus liquet, quod voce Dominica sancto et omnium Apostolorum Petro principi Apostolo, totius Ecclesiæ cura commissa est] . . . cura [ei] totius Ecclesiæ et principatus committitur, et tamen universalis Apostolus non vocatur. [For all who know the Gospel can see that the voice of the Lord conferred upon St. Peter the holy Apostle and chief of all the Apostles the charge of the whole Church. . . . The charge and headship of the whole Church was conferred on him, yet he is not called the Universal Apostle.]—S. Greg. [Magn. *Registri*] *Epistol.* lib. iv. Epist. 76. [lib. v. Indict. xiii. *Epist.* xx. (al. xxxii.) ad Mauricium Augustum, *Op.* tom. ii. col. 748. B, C. Migne, iii. 745.] Therefore neither is his

[CHAPTER VIII.] had declaimed against as monstrous and blasphemous, if not antichristian.[71] Where, by the way, either these two popes, Pelagius and St. Gregory, erred in this weighty business, about an universal bishop over the whole Church; or, if they did not err, Boniface and the rest, which after him took it upon them, were, in their very predecessor's judgment, antichristian. But to proceed. "As yet, the right of election or ratification of the pope continued in the emperor."[72] But then the Lombards grew so great in Italy, and the empire was so infested with Saracens, and such changes happened in all parts of the world, as that neither, for the present, the homage of the pope was useful to the emperor, nor the protection of the emperor available for the pope. By this means, the bishop of Rome was left to play his own game by

successor universal bishop. Numquid ego hac in re, [piissime Domine,] propriam causam defendo? numquid specialem injuriam vindico? et non magis causam omnipotentis Dei et universalis Ecclesiæ? [Am I defending my own cause in this matter, most pious Lord? Am I remonstrating against any special insult shown to me? Rather I am defending the cause of Almighty God and of the universal Church.]—[*Ibid.* D.] where he plainly denies that he speaks in his own cause or in the cause of his see; [Certe pro beati Petri apostolorum principis honore,] per venerandam Chalcedonensem synodum hoc nomen Romano pontifici oblatum est; sed nullus eorum unquam hoc singularitatis nomine uti consensit, ne dum privatum aliquid daretur uni, honore debito sacerdotes privarentur universi. [Quid est ergo quod nos hujus vocabuli gloriam et oblatam non quærimus, et alter sibi hanc arripere et non oblatam præsumit? Doubtless for the honour of the blessed Peter, the chief of the Apostles this title was offered by the venerable Council of Chalcedon to the Roman Pope; but none of them would ever bear this conspicuous title, lest by giving some special honour to one, their proper honour should be taken away from the Bishops in general. Why is it that while we do not take the glory of this title when it is offered to us, another dares to snatch it for himself when no one offers it?—*Ibid.* col. 749. A, B. Migne, iii. 147.] where he plainly says, the Roman bishops rejected this title. And yet for all this, Pope Gregory the Seventh delivers it as one of his dictates in a Council held at Rome about the year 1076: Quod solus Romanus Pontifex jure dicatur universalis. [That the Roman Pope alone is rightly styled universal.] —Baron. [*Annal.*] ad An. 1076. No. 31 et 32. [vide infra, note 84.]

[71] [Sed] absit a cordibus Christianis nomen istud blasphemiæ, [in quo omnium sacerdotum honor adimitur, dum ab uno sibi dementer arrogatur. Let us keep out of the hearts of Christians that blasphemous title by which the honour of all Bishops is impaired; and madly claimed as his own by one of their number.]—S. Gregor. [Magn. *Registr.*] *Epist.* lib. iv. Epist 76. [lib. v. Indict. xiii. *Epist.* xx. (al. xxxii.) ad Mauricium Augustum, *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 749. A. Migne, iii. 746.]—In isto [enim] scelesto vocabulo consentire, nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere. [For to admit that godless expression would be to ruin the faith.]—S. Greg. [Magn. *ut sup.*] lib. iv. Epist. 83. [lib. v. Indict. xiii. *Epist.* xix. (al. xxxix.) ad Sabinianum Diaconum, *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 747. A. Migne, iii. 743.]

[72] Vana tunc [enim] habebatur cleri ac populi electio, nisi id imperatores, aut eorum exarchi, confirmassent. [For at that time the election by clergy and people was considered null and void; unless it were confirmed by the Emperors, or their Exarchs.]—Platina, in *vita Severina I.* [*ut sup.* p. 91].

himself; a thing which as it pleased him well enough, so both he and his successors made great advantage by it. For being grown to that eminence by the emperor, and the greatness of that city and place of his abode, he found himself the more free, the greater the tempest was that beat upon the other. And then first, "he set himself to alienate the hearts of the Italians from the emperor."[73] Next, he opposed himself against him. And about the year 710, Pope Constantine the First did also first of all openly confront Philippicus the emperor, in defence of images, as Onuphrius[74] tells us. After him, Gregory the Second, [A.D. 716,] and the Third,[75] [A.D. 731,] took up his example, and did the like by Leo Isaurus. By this time, the Lombards began to pinch very close, and to vex on all sides, not Italy only, but Rome too. This drives the pope to seek a new patron: and very fitly he meets with Charles Martell,[76] in France, that famous warrior against the Saracens: him he implores in defence of the Church against the Lombards.[77] This address seems very advisedly taken, at least it proves very fortunate to them both; for "in short time, it dissolved the kingdom of the Lombards in

[73] [Joannes Sextus, natione Græcus, eo tempore pontificatum iniit,] quo Theophylactus Exarchus Imperatoris Italiam petens, [primo in Siciliam venit. Quod ubi sensere] milites Itali, veriti ne quid mali ejus adventus portenderet, quod superioribus temporibus fere magis cum pontificibus quam cum imperatoribus sensissent, ingressurum [urbem] Romam interficere constituerant. [John the 6th, a Greek by birth, began his pontificate at the moment when Theophylact, the imperial Exarch, on his way to Italy arrived at Sicily. When news of his coming reached the Italian soldiers, they were afraid his arrival threatened them with harm; and because in those old times they had more sympathy with the popes than with the emperors, they arranged to kill him as he made his entrance into Rome.]—(And the emperor's own governor was fain to be defended from the emperor's own soldiers by the pope's power, who had gotten interest in them against their own master.)—Platina, in *vita Johannis VI.* [*ut sup.* p. 104.] Apsimarus, [calling himself Tiberius,] was then [A.D. 701] emperor: [Justinian II., the lawful emperor, being exiled.]

[74] Primus omnium Romanorum pontificum Imperatori Græco Philippico, in os resistere palam ausus [fuit Constantinus papa. The first of the Roman Popes who dared openly to resist the Emperor was Constantine, who resisted the Greek Emperor Philippicus.] Onuph. [*Annotat.*] in Platin. in *vita Constantini I.* [*ut sup.* p. 107. Bardanes, under the assumed name of Philippicus, was an usurper, and favoured the Iconoclastic heresy, and had expelled the orthodox patriarch Cyrus.]

[75] Platina, in *vita Gregorii II.* [*ut sup.* p. 109.]—Et, *Gregorii III.* [*ut sup.* p. 110.]

[76] [Won the Battle of Tours, which checked the Saracens' advance, and drove them back to Spain in 732; died 741 A.D.]

[77] Ut primo quoque tempore laboranti Romæ et Ecclesiæ auxilium ferret. [That he would bring help at the earliest possible opportunity to Rome and the Church in their difficulties.]—Platina, in *vita Gregorii III.* [*ut sup.* p. 110.]

[CHAPTER VIII.] Italy,"[78]—which had then stood two hundred and four years,—which was the pope's security; and it brought the crown of France into the house of Charles, and shortly after the Western Empire. And now began the pope to be great indeed; for by the bounty of Pipin,[79] son of Charles, that which was taken from the Lombards was given [A.D. 753] to the pope. So that now of a bishop, he became a temporal prince. But when Charles the Great had set up the Western Empire, then he resumed the ancient and original power of the emperor, to govern the Church, to call councils, to order papal elections. And this power continued in his posterity; for this right of the emperor was in force and use in Gregory the Seventh's time, "who was confirmed in the popedom by Henry the Fourth,[80] whom he afterwards deposed."[81] And it might have continued longer, if the succeeding emperors had had abilities enough to secure or vindicate their own right. But the pope, keeping a strong council about him, and meeting with some weak princes, and they ofttimes distracted with great and dangerous wars, grew stronger, till he got the better. So this is enough to show how the popes climbed up by the emperors till they overtopped them; which is all I said before, and have now proved. And this was about the year 1073; for the whole popedom of Gregory the Seventh[82] was begun and ended within the reign of William the Conqueror. Yet was it carried in succeeding times, with great changes of fortune and different success: the emperor sometimes plucking from the pope, and the pope from the emperor;[83] winning and losing ground, as

[78] Quæ res semel incepta cum Longobardici regni excidio finita est. [When this plan was once undertaken, it ended with the destruction of the Lombard kingdom.]—Onuph. [*Annotat.*] in Platin. in *vita Constantini I.* [*ut sup.* p. 107.]

[79] [Made himself king of France in 752; died in 768.] Redditus itaque Romanis exarchatus est: quicquid Padum et Apenninum interjacet. So the Exarchate was restored to the Romans—the whole district which lies between the Po and the Apennines.—Platina, in *vita Stephani II.* [al. III. *ut sup.* p. 115.]

[80] [Of the German house of Franconia. Emperor, 1056-1106 A.D.]

[81] Imperator in gratiam cum Gregorio rediit, eundemque in pontificatu confirmavit, ut tum imperatorum mos erat. [The Emperor made friends again with Gregory; and confirmed him in the Papacy, as was the custom of the Emperors.]—Platina, in *vita Gregor. VII.* [*ut sup.* p. 171.]

[82] [Pope, 1073-1085 A.D.]

[83] Multi deinde fuerunt imperatores Henrico similiores, quam Julio Cæsari; quos subigere non fuit difficile, cum domi rerum omnium securi [desiderent, ubi maxime opus erat pontificum cupiditatem virtute et legitimis modis reprimere. After this there were many emperors more like Henry than Julius Cæsar; and it was easy to keep them under, for they wished to be comfortable in everything at home, just when there was most need to use courage and legitimate means for restraining the greed of the Popes.]—Calvin. *Instit.*

their spirits, abilities, aids, and opportunities were, till at the last the pope settled himself upon the grounds laid by Gregory the Seventh,[84] in the great power which he now uses, in and over these parts of the Christian world.

XIII. Thirdly, A. C., knowing it is not enough to say this, "That the pope is pastor of the whole Church,"[85] labours to prove it. And first, he tells us, "that Irenæus intimates so much"; but he doth not tell us where. And he is much scanted of ancient proof, if Irenæus stand alone. Besides, Irenæus was a bishop of the Gallican Church, and a very unlikely man to captivate the liberty of that Church under "the more powerful principality" of Rome. And how can we have better evidence of his judgment touching that principality, than the actions of his life? When Pope Victor[86] excommunicated the Asian Churches, ἀθρόως, "all at a blow,"[87] was not Irenæus the chief man that reprehended him for it? A very unmeet and undutiful thing, sure, it had been in Irenæus, in deeds to tax him of rashness and inconsiderateness, whom in words A. C. would have to be

lib. iv. cap. ii. § 13. [*Op.*, tom. viii. pp. 327, 328.]

[84] For in a synod at Rome, about the year 1076, Pope Gregory the Seventh established certain brief conclusions, twenty-seven in number, upon which stands almost all the greatness of the papacy. These conclusions are called *Dictatus Papæ*; and they are reckoned up by Baronius, in the year 1076, No. 31, 33, etc. But whether the dictatorship did now first invade the Church, I cannot certainly say. The chief of these propositions follow here:—

Quod solus Rom. pontifex jure dicatur Universalis.

Quod solius papæ pedes omnes principes deosculentur.

Quod illi liceat imperatores deponere.

Quod nulla synodus absque præcepto ejus debet Generalis vocari.

Quod nullum capitulum, nullusque liber canonicus habeatur absque illius auctoritate.

Quod sententia illius a nullo debeat retractari; et ipse omnium solus retractare potest.

Quod Rom. Ecclesia nunquam erravit, nec in perpetuum, Scriptura testante, errabit.

Quod Rom. pontifex, si canonice fuerit ordinatus, meritis B. Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus, [testante S. Ennodio, etc.]

Quod a fidelitate iniquorum subjectos potest absolvere.

[The Roman Pope alone is rightly styled universal.

All princes ought to kiss the Pope's feet, and the Pope's feet only.

The Pope has the power to depose Emperors.

No Council can be called general without his command.

No Chapter and no Book is to be held canonical without his authority.

No one may revoke his decision; he alone can revoke it.

The Roman Church has never erred, and the Scripture bears witness that it never will err.

The Roman Pope, if canonically ordained, is undoubtedly made holy by the merits of S. Peter (as St. Ennodius, etc. testify).

He can absolve subjects from their fealty to wicked lords.]

[85] [Bishop of Lyons, 178 A.D.]

[86] [Pope of Rome, 192-202 A.D.]

[87] Euseb. [*Eccl. Hist.*] lib. v. cap. 24. [apud *Eccl. Hist. Script.* tom. i. p. 245. ed. Reading; *ubi sup.* p. 156. note 24.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

acknowledged by him "the supreme and infallible pastor of the universal Church." But the place of Irenæus which A. C. means, I think, is this, where he uses these words indeed, but short of A. C.'s sense of it: "To this Church," (he speaks of Rome,) "*propter potentiorem principalitatem*, 'for the more powerful principality of it,' it is necessary that every Church, that is, the faithful, *undique*, 'round about,' should have recourse."[88] "Should have recourse," so A. C. translates it. And what doth this avail him? Very great reason was there in Irenæus's time, that upon any difference arising in the faith, *omnes undique fideles*, "all the faithful," or, if you will, all the Churches, "round about," should have recourse—that is, resort—to Rome, being the imperial city, and so a Church of "more powerful principality" than any other at that time in those parts of the world. Well, will this exalt Rome to be the head of the Church universal? What if the states and policies of the world be much changed since, and this conveniency of resorting to Rome be quite ceased? then is not Rome divested of her "more powerful principality?" But the meaning of A. C. is, We must so have recourse to Rome, as to submit our faith to hers; and then, not only in Irenæus's time, but through

A. C. p. 58.

[88] [Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ, et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem, et annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo, vel per sui placentiam malam, (al. sibi placentiam,) vel vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præterquam opertet, colligunt.] Ad hanc [enim] Ecclesiam, propter potentiorem [al. potiorem] principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles; in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio. [But since it is a very lengthy business, in my little volume, to go over the succession of Bishops in all the Churches, we point to the tradition of the greatest and most ancient Church, which is thoroughly known to all, founded and organised at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul. We point, I say, to that tradition which this Church has from the Apostles, and to her faith proclaimed to all men which comes down to our time through succeeding bishops. So we confound all those who in any manner, either for their personal liking, or for vainglory or by blindness and wrong opinion assemble illegally. For to this Church, on account of its special headship, every Church has to come, that is, all those who are true to the faith from every quarter (or round about), and in it the faithful from every quarter (or round about) have always preserved the tradition of the Apostles.] —S. Irenæus *adv. Hæreses*, lib. iii. cap. 3. [*Op.*, p. 201. ed. Grabe. Migne, vii. 848. Some modern Roman controversialists translate "convenire ad," as "agree with." The phrase occurs 26 times in the Vulgate, and always means "resort to," or "come together to." No confirmation of the sense "agree with" has been produced. The use of "undique" also confirms the sense of "resort to." Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, 3rd edition, pp. 19 to 35.]

all times, reform ourselves by her rule; that is, all the faithful, not *undique*, "round about," but *ubique*, "everywhere," must agree with Rome in point of faith. This he means, and Rome may thank him for it. But this Irenæus saith not, nor will his words bear it; nor durst A. C. therefore construe him so, but was content to smooth it over with this ambiguous phrase of "having recourse to Rome." Yet this is a place as much stood upon by them, as any other in all antiquity. And should I grant them their own sense, "That all the faithful everywhere must agree with Rome,"—which I may give, but can never grant,—yet were not this saying any whit prejudicial to us now. For, first, here is a "powerful principality" ascribed to the Church of Rome. And that, no man of learning doubts but the Church of Rome had within its own patriarchate and jurisdiction; and that "was very large," containing all the provinces in the diocese of Italy,[89] in the old sense of the word diocese, which provinces the lawyers and others term *suburbicarias*. There were ten of them: The three islands, Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia; and the other seven upon the firm land of Italy. And this, I take it, is plain in Ruffinus. For he living shortly after the Nicene council, as he did, and being of Italy, as he was, he might very well know the bounds of that patriarch's jurisdiction, as it was then practised. And he says expressly, "that according to the old custom, the Roman patriarch's charge was confined within the limits of the suburbicarian Churches."[90] To avoid the force of this testimony,

[89] Ed. Brierwood, of the *Jurisdiction and Limits of the Patriarchs, in the time of the Nicene Council.*—Ad. Qu. i. MS. ["*The Patriarchal Government of the Ancient Church, declared by way of answere unto four questions proposed unto Edward Brereward.*" The author, the first Professor of Mathematics at Gresham College, died in 1613; this tract was printed at Oxford, in 1641, at p. 96, of "Certain Briefe Treatises written by divers learned men concerning the ancient and moderne Government of the Church." The passage of which Laud gives the substance is at p. 99, taken, as it would seem, from the then unpublished MS. Salmasius only allows the authority of the Roman Patriarch in the early ages to have extended over the district of the City Prefect, which ended at the 100th milestone from Rome. Probably it included the district of the Vicarius, which extended over the whole of South Italy, but not over the North of Italy, of which Milan was the capital; and the Archbishop of Milan consequently the Ecclesiastical head.]

[90] Apud Alexandriam, et in urbe Roma, vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut [vel] ille Ægypt. [vel] hic suburbicariarum ecclesiarum solicitudinem gerat.—Ruffin. *Eccl. Hist.* lib. i. cap. 6. [or, the *Continuation of Eusebius*, lib. x. cap. 6. apud *Hist. Eccl. Auctores*, p. 221. ed. Basil. 1529. As in Alexandria, so in Rome, there is to be observed the ancient custom; that as the first Bishop is to superintend the Egyptian Churches, so the second is to superintend the Suburban Churches (of the district). Some scholars think that this Latin form of

[CHAPTER VIII.]

Cardinal Perron[91] lays load upon Ruffinus; for he charges him with passion, ignorance, and rashness. And one piece of his ignorance is, that he hath ill translated the canon of the Council of Nice. Now, be that as it may, I neither do nor can approve his translation of that canon; nor can it be easily proved, that he purposely intended a translation. All that I urge is, that Ruffinus, living in that time and place, was very like well to know and understand the limits and bounds of that patriarchate of Rome in which he lived. Secondly, here is, that it had *potentiorem*, "a more powerful" principality than other Churches had. And that the Protestants grant too; and that, not only because the Roman prelate was *ordine primus*, "first in order and degree"—which some one must be, to avoid confusion—"but also, because the Roman see had won a great deal of credit, and gained a great deal of power to itself in Church affairs: because, while the Greek, yea, and the African Churches too, were turbulent, and distracted with many and dangerous opinions, the Church of Rome all that while, and a good while after Irenæus too, was more calm and constant to the truth."[92] Thirdly, here is a necessity, say they, required, "That every Church—that is, the faithful, which are everywhere—agree with that Church." But what? simply with that Church, whatever it do or believe? No, nothing less. For Irenæus adds, "With that Church, *in qua*, in

the Canon is the form brought back by Bishop Cæcilian of Carthage from the Council of Nicaea. If so, the Roman Primacy was confined in 325 A.D. to Southern Italy; and Milan was already the metropolitical See of N. Italy. Milan, Aquileia (which was for 150 years, 557-698 A.D., out of communion with Rome) and Ravenna were each at the head of independent provinces in later years at all events. Cf. Puller, *Primitive Saints*, *passim*. But the Greek form of the Canon differs.—The Nicene canon is the sixth: Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω· τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πεντατόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ὅπερ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθες ἐστιν· Let the ancient customs be kept. The custom in Egypt, and Libya and the Pentapolis, is that the Bishop of Alexandria shall have authority over all these Churches; as it is the custom at Rome for the Roman Bishop to have this same authority.—*Conc.* ed. Labbe, tom. ii. col. 32.]

[91] Perron. lib. ii. of his *Reply*, cap. 6. [It is the 33rd chapter of Cardinal Perron's first book of the *Réplique à la Réponse du Roy de la Grand Bretagne*, which discusses l'addition du mot, Eglises suburbicaires, faitte par Ruffin à la version Latine des Canons du Concile de Nicée.—P. 215. etc. ed. Paris, 1620. The king against whom the Cardinal wrote was James I. of England.]

[92] Cum Orientales et Græcæ ecclesiæ, Africanæ etiam, multis opinionum dissensionibus inter se tumultuarentur, hæc sedatior aliis, et minus turbulenta fuerit. [While the Churches of the East and of Greece, and also of Africa were disturbed by many differences of opinion among their members, this Church (viz. Rome) was quieter than the rest and less turbulent.]—Calvin. *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 6. § 16. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 298.]

which, is conserved that tradition which was delivered by the apostles." And God forbid but it should be necessary for all Churches, and all the faithful, to agree with that ancient apostolic Church in all those things in which it keeps to the doctrine and discipline delivered by the apostles. In Irenæus's time, it kept these better than any other Church; and by this, in part, obtained *potentiorem principalitatem*, "a greater power" than other Churches, but not over all other Churches. And, as they understand Irenæus, a necessity lay upon all other Churches to agree with this; but this necessity was laid upon them by the "then integrity of the Christian faith there professed, not by the universality of the Roman jurisdiction now challenged." And let Rome reduce itself to the observation of tradition apostolic, to which it then held; and I will say, as Irenæus did, "that it will be then necessary for every Church, and for the faithful everywhere, to agree with it." Lastly, let me observe too, that Irenæus made no doubt but that Rome might fall away from apostolical tradition, as well as other particular Churches of great name have done. For he does not say, *in qua servanda semper erit*, sed *in qua servata est*: not, "in which Church the doctrine delivered from the apostles *shall ever be* entirely kept,"—that had been home indeed—but "in which," by God's grace and mercy, "*it was*" to that time of Irenæus so "kept and preserved." So we have here, in Irenæus's judgment, the Church of Rome then entire, but not infallible; and endowed with "a more powerful principality" than other Churches, but not with an universal dominion over all other Churches; which is the thing in question.

Section XXV.

XIV. But to this place of Irenæus, A. C. joins a reason of his own. For he tells us, "the bishop of Rome is St. Peter's successor," and therefore to him we must have recourse. The fathers, I deny not, ascribe very much to St. Peter; but it is to St. Peter in his own person. And among them, Epiphanius[98] is as free and as frequent in extolling St. Peter as any of them, and yet did he never intend to give an absolute principality to Rome in St. Peter's right. There is a noted place in that father, where his words are these: "For the Lord Himself made St. Peter the first of the apostles, a firm rock, upon which the Church of God is built, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, etc. For in him the faith is made firm every way, who received the key of heaven, etc. For in him all the questions and subtleties of the

A. C. p. 58.

[98] [Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, 367-403 A.D.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

faith are found."[94] This is a great place at first sight too, and deserves a marginal note, to call young readers' eyes to view it. And it hath this note in the old Latin edition, at Paris, 1564: "*Petri principatus et præstantia*," "Peter's principality and excellency." This place, as much show as it makes for the Roman principality, I shall easily clear, and yet do no wrong either to St. Peter or the Roman Church. For most manifest it is, that the authority of St. Peter is urged here to prove the Godhead of the Holy Ghost.[95] And then follow the eulogies given to St. Peter, the better to set off and make good that authority: as that he was "*princeps apostolorum*,[96] 'the prince of the apostles,' and pronounced blessed by Christ; because as God the Father revealed to him the Godhead of the Son, so did the Son the Godhead of the Holy Ghost." After this, Epiphanius calls him "*solidam petram*,[97] 'a solid rock,' upon which the Church of God was founded, and against which the gates of hell should not prevail." And adds, "that the faith was rooted and made firm in him[98] every way, in him who received the key of heaven." And after this, he gives the reason of all: "Because in him,"—mark, I pray,

[94] Ipse autem Dominus constituit eum primum apostolorum, petram firmam super quam Ecclesia Dei ædificata est, et portæ inferorum non valebunt adversus illam, etc. Juxta omnem enim modum in ipso firmata est fides, qui accepit clavem cœlorum, etc. In hoc enim omnes quæstiones ac subtilitates fidei inveniuntur.—[But the Lord Himself appointed him chief of the Apostles, a firm rock, etc. etc. as in text.]—Epiphan. *in Ancorato.* [cap. ix.] ed. Paris. Lat. 1564. fol. 497. A. ed. vero Græco-Latin, tom. ii. p. 14. [B. ed. Petav. Paris. 1622. *Εδει τὸν πρῶτον τῶν Ἀποστόλων τὴν πέτραν τὴν στερεὰν, ἐφ' ἣν ἡ Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ᾠκοδόμηται, καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς· πύλαι μὲν ᾅδου αἱ αἱρέσεις καὶ οἱ αἱρεσιάρχαι· κατὰ πάντα γὰρ τρόπον ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστερεώθη ἡ πίστις, ἐν τῷ λαβόντι τὴν κλεῖν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐν τῷ λύοντι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ δεόντι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· ἐν τούτῳ γάρ ἐστι πάντα τὰ ζητούμενα λεπτολογήματα τῆς πίστεως εὑρισκόμενα.* It was necessary that the first of the Apostles should be the strong rock, on which the Church of God was built, and the gates of hell could not prevail against it. The gates of hell are heresies and heresiarchs. For in every way faith was strengthened in him; since he received the key of heaven, since he was empowered to loose on earth and to bind in heaven. For in this are found the solutions of all the subtleties of the faith.]

[95] [*Φησὶ οὖν ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος τοῖς περὶ Ἀνανίαν·*] *τί ὅτι ἐπείρασεν* [*ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς ψεύσασθαι τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ; καὶ φησὶ, Οὐκ ἐψεύσασθε ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ Θεῷ· ἄρα Θεὸς ἐκ Πατρὸς, καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ᾧ ἐψεύσαντο οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ τιμήματος νοσφισάμενοι.* The Blessed Peter says therefore in the business of Ananias: Why is it that Satan has tempted thee to lie to the Holy Ghost? And he goes on, "thou hast not lied to men but to God." Therefore the Spirit is sent from the Father and the Son, to Whom those who kept back part of the price lied.] (For there begins the argument of Epiphanius.—[*ibid.* p. 14. A.]

[96] *ὁ κορυφαιότατος.* [The chiefest.]—[*ibid.*]

[97] *τὴν στερεὰν πέτραν.* [The firm rock.]—[*ibid.*]

[98] *καὶ πάντα γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.* [For in all things.]—[*ibid.*]

it is still "in him," as he was blessed by that revelation from God the Father, St. Matt. xvi.—"were found all the λεπτολογήματα, 'the very niceties' and exactness of the Christian faith."[99] For he professed the Godhead of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and so, *omni modo*, every point of faith was rooted in him. And this is the full meaning of that learned father, in this passage. Now, therefore, "building the Church upon St. Peter," in Epiphanius's sense, is not as if he and his successors were to be monarchs over it for ever; but it is the edifying and establishing the Church in the true faith of Christ, by the confession which St. Peter made. And so he expresses himself elsewhere most plainly: "St. Peter," saith he, "who was made to us indeed a solid rock, firming the faith of our Lord; on which rock the Church is built *juxta omnem modum*, 'every way.'[100] First, that he confessed Christ to be the Son of the living God; and by and by he heard, 'Upon this rock of solid faith I will build My Church.' And the same confession he made of the Holy Ghost." Thus was St. Peter a solid rock, upon which the Church was founded *omni modo*, "every way"; that is, the faith of the Church was confirmed by him in every point.[101] But that St. Peter was any rock or foundation of the Church, so as that he and his successors must be relied on in all matters of faith, and govern the Church like princes or monarchs, that Epiphanius never thought of. And that he did never think so, I prove it thus. For beside this apparent meaning of his context, as is here expressed, how could he possibly think of a

SECTION XXV.

Matt. xvi. 17.

[99] ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ. [For in him.] —[*ibid.*]

[100] ὃς γέγονεν [ἡμῖν ἀληθῶς στερεὰ Πέτρα θεμελιοῦσα τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐφ' ᾗ ᾠκοδόμητο ἡ ἐκκλησία κατὰ πάντα τρόπον· πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ὡμολόγησε Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, καὶ ἤκουσεν, ὅτι ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ ταύτῃ τῆς ἀσφαλῆς πίστεως οἰκοδομήσω μοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ἐπειδὴ σαφῶς αὐτὸν ὡμολόγησεν Υἱὸν ἀληθινὸν . . . . Ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὁ αὐτὸς ἀσφαλίζεται ἡμᾶς, λέγων τοῖς περὶ Ἀνανίαν, κ.τ.λ. Who was made for us truly a solid Rock, becoming the foundation of faith in the Lord, on which the Church was built in every way; first because he confessed Christ to be the Son of the Living God, and heard "on this work of the sure faith I will build My Church": when he openly confessed Him to be the real Son of God. . . . But further, with regard to the Holy Ghost, the same Apostle confirms our faith, saying in the business of Ananias, etc. Here follows the argument for the Godhead of the Holy Ghost.]—Qui factus est nobis revera solida petra firmans fidem Domini. In qua (petra) ædificata est ecclesia juxta omnem modum. Primo, quod confessus est Christum esse Filium Dei vivi, et statim audivit, Super hanc petram solidæ fidei ædificabo Ecclesiam Meam . . . Etiam de Sp. Sancto idem, etc. — Epiphan. [*adversus Hæres.*] lib. ii. tom. i. [cap. 7, 8.] *Hæres.* lix. contra Catharos, [*Op.*,] tom. i. p. 500. [B, C.] ed. Græco-Latin. [Petav. Paris. 1622. Migne, i. 1629.]

[101] περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὁ αὐτὸς ἀσφαλίζεται ἡμᾶς. ["With regard to the Holy Ghost the same Apostle confirms our faith, etc."]—*ibid.* [cap. 8.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

supremacy due to St. Peter's successor, that in most express terms, and that twice repeated,[102] makes St. James, the brother of our Lord, and not St. Peter, "succeed our Lord in the principality of the Church"? And Epiphanius was too full both of learning and industry, to speak contrary to himself in a point of this moment.

XV. Next, since A. C. speeds no better with Irenæus, he will have it out of Scripture. And he still tells us, "the bishop of Rome is St. Peter's successor." Well, suppose that. What then?

A. C. p. 58.

What? Why then he succeeded in all St. Peter's prerogatives[103] which are ordinary, and belonged to him as a bishop, though not in the extraordinary, which belonged to him as an apostle. For that is it which you all say, but no man proves.[104] If this be so, yet then I must tell A. C., St. Peter in his ordinary power was never made "pastor of the whole Church"; nay, in his extraordinary, he had no "more powerful principality"[105] than the other apostles had. A "primacy of order"[106] was never denied him by the Protestants; and an "universal supremacy of power" was never granted him by the primitive Christians. Yea, but "Christ promised the keys to St. Peter." True, but so did He to all the rest of the apostles; and to their successors as much as to

Matt. xvi. [19].
Matt. xviii. [18].
John xx. [23].

[102] Ille primus, (speaking of St. James, the Lord's brother), episcopalem cathedram cepit, quum ei ante cæteros omnes suum in terris thronum Dominus tradidisset. [Καὶ πρῶτος οὗτος εἴληφε τὴν καθέδραν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ᾧ πεπίστευκε Κύριος τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πρώτῳ· He was the first (St. James, the Lord's brother) to take an Episcopal See; and to him first the Lord entrusted His throne upon the earth.]—Epiphan. [*adversus Hæres.*] lib. iii. tom. ii. [cap. 7.] *Hæres.* lxxviii. [contra Antidicomarianitas, *Op.*, tom. i.] p. 1039. [B. ed. Petav. Paris. 1622.]—Et fere similiter, [Κατασταθέντος εὐθὺς Ἰακὼβ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Κυρίου καλουμένου καὶ ἀποστόλου, ἐπισκόπου πρώτου υἱου τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ φύσει ὄντες, κ.τ.λ. James, called the Lord's brother, and an Apostle, was at once appointed the first Bishop, being by birth the son of Joseph.]—Epiphan. [*adversus Hæres.* lib. i. tom. ii. [cap. 3. in fin.] *Hæres.* xxix. [contra Nazaræos, *Op.*, tom. i. p. 119. A.]

[103] Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. i. cap. 9. § 45. [*ubi sup.* p. 192. note 25.]

[104] Sect. xxv. No. 10. [*ubi sup.* p. 191.]

[105] Bellarmin. *ibid.* [*ubi sup.* p. 192. note 25.]

[106] "The fathers gave three prerogatives to St. Peter: of Authority, of Primacy, and of Principality; but not of supremacy of power."—*Rainoldes against Hart*, chap. v. Divis. iii. And he proves it at large. [His words are: "These sayings, and the like, which are alleged out of the fathers, do touch three prerogatives which they give to Peter: the first, of Authority; the second, of Primacy; the third, of Principality. But none of them all doth prove the supremacy which you pretend to Peter, and mean to the pope. For by that supremacy is signified the fulness of ecclesiastical, or rather papal, power, even a power sovereign of governing the Church throughout the whole world, in all points and matters of doctrine and discipline."—*The Sum of the Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart*, etc. p. 172. ed. London, 1609.]

his. So it is *tibi et illis*, not *tibi non illis*, "I give the keys to thee and them," not "to thee to exclude them"; unless any man will think heaven-gates so easy, that they might open and shut them without the keys. And St. Augustine is plain: "If this were said only to St. Peter, then the Church hath no power to do it";[107] which, God forbid! The keys therefore were given to St. Peter and the rest, in a figure of the Church, to whose power and for whose use they were given. But there is not one key in all that bunch, that can let in St. Peter's successors to a "more powerful principality universal" than the successors of the other apostles had.

SECTION XXV.

John xi. 42.

XVI. Yea, but Christ prayed "that St. Peter's faith might not fail." That is true; and in that sense that Christ prayed, St. Peter's faith failed not; that is, in application to his person, "for his perseverance in the faith," as St. Prosper[108] applies it. "Which perseverance yet he must owe and acknowledge to the grace of Christ's prayer for him, not to the power and ability of his own free will," as St. Jerome[109] tells us. Bellarmine[110] likes

A. C. p. 58.

Luke xxii. 32

[107] [Unus malus corpus malorum significat: quomodo Petrus corpus bonorum, immo corpus ecclesiæ, sed in bonis. Nam si in Petro non esset Ecclesiæ sacramentum, non ei diceret Dominus, Tibi dabo claves, etc.] Si hoc Petro tantum dictum est, non facit hoc Ecclesia. [Si autem et in Ecclesia fit, ut quæ in terra ligantur, in cœlo ligentur, et quæ solvuntur in terra, solvantur in cœlo, etc. Si hoc ergo in Ecclesia fit, Petrus, quando claves accepit, ecclesiam sanctam significavit. One bad man stands for the whole body of bad men; and in the same way Peter stands for the whole body of good men, *i.e.* the body of the Church, but consisting of the good ones. For if it was not the Sacrament of the Church which was represented in Peter's case, the Lord would not have said to him, "I will give thee the keys." If this was said only to Peter, the Church does not exercise this power. But if it is exercised in the Church, then what are bound on earth are bound in heaven, and what are loosed on earth are loosed in heaven, etc. If this then is exercised in the Church, Peter, when he received the keys, stood for the Holy Church.]—S. Augustin. *in Johann. Evang.* [cap. xii.] Tractat. l. [12. *Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 633. D, E. Migne, 1762.]

[108] Deum dare, ut in fide perseveretur, [ita promitur: Dixit autem Jesus Petro, Simon, Simon, etc. That God would grant that he should persevere in the faith; so it is related; but Jesus said to Peter, Simon, Simon, etc.—S. Prosper. [seu potius ignot. auctor.] *de Vocat. Gent.* lib. i. cap. 24. [apud *Op.*, S. Prosper. col. 885. A. Migne, 685.]

[109] [Ego autem] rogavi [pro te] ut non deficeret, etc. Et certe juxta vos in apostoli erat positum potestate, si voluisset, ut non deficeret fides ejus. [I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and evidently if you are right, it was left in the Apostle's power that his faith should not fail, if he wished it.]—S. Hieron. [*Dialog.*] *adversus Pelegianos*, lib. ii. *Op.*, tom. iv. par. 2. col. 521.

[110] [Sine dubio hic Dominus] aliquid speciale [Petro impetravit, ut patet ex designatione certæ personæ: perseverantia autem in gratia est donum commune omnium electorum. Some very special gift He asked for Peter, as is made evident by His naming a particular person; but perseverance in faith is the common gift given to all the elect.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.*

[CHAPTER VIII.]

not this, "because," saith he, "Christ here obtained some special privilege for St. Peter, whereas perseverance in grace is a gift common to all the elect." And he is so far right. And the special grace which this prayer of Christ obtained for St. Peter was, that he should not fall into a final apostasy; no, not when Satan had sifted him to the bran, that he fell most horribly even into a threefold denial of his Master, and that with a curse. And to recover this, and persevere, was *aliquid speciale*, I trow, if anything ever were. But this will not down with Bellarmine. No; "The *aliquid speciale*,[111] 'the special thing' here obtained was," saith he, "that neither St. Peter himself, nor any other that should sit in his seat, should ever teach anything contrary to the true faith." That St. Peter, after his recovery, should preach nothing, either as apostle or bishop, contrary to the faith, will easily be granted him; but that none of his successors should do it, but be all infallible, that certainly never came within the compass of *Rogavi pro te, Petre*, "I have prayed for thee, Peter." And Bellarmine's proof of this is his just confutation. For he proves this exposition of that text only by the testimony of seven popes in their own cause; and then takes a leap to Theophylact,[112] who says nothing to the purpose. So that, upon the matter, Bellarmine confesses there is not one father of the Church, disinterested in the cause, that understands this text as Bellarmine doth, till you come down to Theophylact. So the pope's infallibility appeared to nobody but the popes themselves, for above a thousand years after Christ—for so long it was before Theophylact[113] lived. And the spite of it is, Theophylact could not see it neither. For the most that Bellarmine makes him say, is but this: "Because I account thee as chief of My disciples, confirm the rest; for this becomes thee, which art to be a rock and foundation of the Church after Me."[114]

lib. iv. cap. 3. [§ 3. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 806. A.]

[111] Ut ipse tanquam pontifex non posset unquam docere aliquid contra fidem, sive, ut in sede ejus nunquam inveniretur, qui doceret [contra veram fidem. Ex quibus privilegiis, primum fortasse non manavit ad posteros: at secundum sine dubio manavit ad posteros, sive successores. That he, as Pope, should never teach anything contrary to the faith, or that in his seat should never be found a man to teach contrary to the true faith. Of which privileges, the first perhaps did not pass down to those who came after him; but the second did without a doubt to those who came after him and took his place.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 3. [§ 5, 6. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 806. C.]

[112] [For the Seven Popes, *ubi sup.* pp. 20 and 21.]

[113] [Theophylactus, born at Constantinople, Archbishop of Bulgaria, lived about An. Dom. 1072.]

[114] Præter hos [pontifices, non desunt etiam alii auctores, qui eodem modo exponunt. Theophylactus in cap. xxii. *Lucæ* aperte docet, dari Petro hoc

For this is personal too, and of St. Peter, and that as he was an apostle; for otherwise than as an apostle, he was not a rock or foundation of the Church, no, not in a secondary sense. The special privilege therefore which Christ prayed for, was personal to St. Peter, and is that which before I mentioned. And Bellarmine himself says, that "Christ obtained by this prayer two privileges, special ones, for St. Peter":[115] the one, "that he should never quite fall from the true faith, how strongly soever he were tempted"; the other, "that there should never be found any sitting in his seat, that should teach against it." Now for the first of these, Bellarmine[116] "doubts it did not flow over to his successors." Why, then, it is true, which I here say, that this was personal to St. Peter. "But the second," he says, "out of all doubt passed over to his successors." Nay, that is not out of all doubt neither: First, because many learned men have challenged many popes for teaching heresy; and that is against the true faith. And that which so many learned men have affirmed, is not out of all doubt; or if it be, why does Bellarmine take so much pains to confute and disprove them as he doth?[117] Secondly, because Christ obtained of His Father everything that He prayed for, if He prayed for it absolutely, and not under a condition: "Father, I know thou hearest Me always." Now, Christ here prayed absolutely for

privilegium, quia ipse futurus erat princeps, et caput aliorum, ac proinde dari omnibus aliis, qui illi in principatu succederent:] Quia te habeo, inquit, principem discipulorum, confirma cæteros. Hoc enim decet te, qui post Me ecclesiæ petra es et fundamentum. Besides these popes, other writers can be found who explain the passage in the same manner. Theophylact, in the 22nd chapter of St. Luke, plainly teaches that this special gift was given to St. Peter, because he was to be chief and head of the rest, and further, was to be given to all those who should be his successors in the monarchy (*i.e.* of the Church); because I hold you, says Christ, as chief of the disciples, strengthen the rest. For this is your duty, since after Me you are the rock and foundation of the Church.—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 3. [§ 13. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 807. D. The original words are: Οτι ἐπειδή σε τῶν μαθητῶν ἔξαρχον ἔχω . . . στήριξον τοὺς λοιπούς. τοῦτο γὰρ προσήκει σοι, ὡς μετ' ἐμὲ ὄντι τῆς ἐκκλησίας πέτρᾳ καὶ στηρίγματι. Since I make you chief of the Disciples, strengthen the rest. But this is your office, since you after Me are the rock and foundation of the Church.]—Theophylact. in *Luc.* xxii. [p. 471. B. ed. Paris. 1635. Migne, i. 1073.]

[115] Impetraverit, etc.—*ibid.* § 5. [*ubi sup.* p. 215. note 110.]

[116] Ex quibus privilegiis primum fortasse non manavit ad posteros, at secundum sine dubio manavit ad posteros sive successores.—Bellarmin. *ibid.* [*ubi sup.* p. 216. note 111.]

[117] Bellarmin. [*de Rom. Pont.*] lib. iv. cap. 8. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 819. et seqq. This chapter and those which follow it, are occupied by Bellarmine with refuting charges which had been made, chiefly by the Madgeburg Centuriators, against several of the popes, forty in number.]

[CHAPTER VIII.]

St. Peter; therefore, whatsoever He asked for him was granted. Therefore, if Christ intended his successors as well as himself, His prayer was granted for his successors as well as for himself. But then, if Bellarmine will tell us absolutely, as he doth, "that the whole gift obtained by this prayer for St. Peter did belong to his successors";[118] and then by and by after, break this gift into two parts, and call the first part into doubt, whether it belongs to his successors or no, he cannot say the second part is out of all doubt. For if there be reason of doubting the one, there is as much reason of doubting the other, since they stand both on the same foot, the validity of Christ's prayer for St. Peter.

XVII. Yea, but "Christ charged St. Peter to govern and feed His whole flock." Nay, soft! It is but His sheep and His lambs; and that every apostle, and every apostle's successor, hath charge to do.[119] But over the whole flock I find no one apostle or successor set. And it is a poor shift to say, as A. C. doth, "that the Bishop of Rome is set over the whole flock, because both over lambs and sheep"; for in every flock, that is not of barren wethers, there are lambs and sheep, that is, weaker and stronger Christians;[120] not people and pastors, subjects and governors, as A. C. expounds it, to bring the necks of princes under Roman pride.

John xxi. 15.

A. C. p. 58.

[118] [Quarto,] donum hoc loco Petro impetratum, etiam ad successores pertinet: [nam Christus oravit pro Petro in utilitatem ecclesiæ; ecclesia autem semper indiget aliquo, a quo confirmetur, cujus fides deficere non possit. Fourthly, the gift in this passage obtained for Peter also belongs to his successors, for Christ made the petition for Peter for the sake of the Church; and the Church always wants some one who shall strengthen it, whose faith cannot fail.] —Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 3. § 3.

[119] *Matt.* xxviii. 29, [19.] and *Matt.* x. 17. [7.] the same power and charge is given to them all.

[120] And this seems to me to allude to that of St. Paul, *1 Cor.* iii. 2. and *Heb.* v. 12: "Some are fed with milk, and some with stronger meat." The lambs with milk, and the sheep with stronger meat. But here A. C. follows Pope Hildebrand close, who in the case of [Henry IV.] the emperor then, asked this question. [Quibus ita pontifex:] Quando, [inquit,] Christus ecclesiam suam Petro commisit, et dixit, Pasce oves meas, excepitne reges? [To whom the Pope spoke as follows: When Christ committed the charge of his Church to Peter and said, Feed my sheep, did He except Kings?]—Platina, [*Vitæ Pontific.*] in vita Greg. VII. [p. 173.] And certainly kings are not excepted from being fed by the Church; but from being spoiled of their kingdom by any churchmen, that they are. [This is one of the passages on which the Vatican Council of 1870 vested its decree on Papal Infallibility. The Roman controversialists claim that it is a special commission given to St. Peter, to feed the whole Church, including his fellow Apostles. The Greek Fathers connect the threefold charge with the threefold denial. Cf. S. Chrys. Hom. lxxxviii. *in Joh. Ev.* § 1. Opp. ed. Ben. viii. 525; St. Cyril of Alexandria *in S. Joann.* lib. xii. cap. 1. ed. Phil. Pusey, 1872. iii. 164-166; S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxxix. § 18. Opp. ed. Ben. i. 689. For full discussion of the question, cf. Puller, *Primitive Saints*, etc., pp. 117 to 128.]

And if kings be meant, yet then the command is, *Pasce*, "feed" them; but *deponere*, or *occidere*, to "depose," or "kill" them, is not *pascere* in any sense: *lanii id est, non pastoris*; "that is the butcher's, not the shepherd's part." If a sheep goes astray never so far, it is not the shepherd's part to kill him; at least if he do, *non pascit dum occidit*, "he doth not certainly feed while he kills." SECTION XXV.

XVIII. And for the close, "That the bishop of Rome shall never refuse to feed and govern the whole flock in such sort, as that neither particular man, nor Church, shall have just cause, under pretence of reformation in manners or faith, to make a separation from the whole Church";—by A. C.'s favour, this is mere begging of the question. He says, the pope shall ever govern the whole Church so as that there shall be no just cause given of a separation. And that is the very thing which the Protestants charge upon him; namely, that he hath governed, if not the whole, yet so much of the Church as he hath been able to bring under his power, so as that he hath given too just cause of the present continued separation. And as the corruptions in the doctrine of faith in the Church of Rome were the cause of the first separation, so are they at this present day the cause why the separation continues. And further, I, for my part, am clear of opinion, that the errors in the doctrine of faith which are charged upon the whole Church, at least so much of the whole as in these parts of Europe hath been kept under the Roman jurisdiction, have had their original and continuance from this, That so much of the universal Church (which indeed they account all) hath forgotten her own liberty, and submitted to the Roman Church and bishop; and so is in a manner forced to embrace all the corruptions which the particular Church of Rome hath contracted upon itself; and being now not able to free herself from the Roman jurisdiction, is made to continue also in all her corruptions. And for the Protestants, they have made no separation from the general Church, properly so called (for therein A. C. said well, "the pope's administration can give no cause to separate from that"), but their separation is only from the Church of Rome, and such other churches as, by adhering to her, have hazarded themselves, and do now miscall themselves the whole Catholic Church. Nay, even here the Protestants have not left the Church of Rome in her essence, but in her errors; not in the things which constitute a Church, but only in such abuses and corruptions as work toward the dissolution of a Church.

A. C. p. 58.

A. C. p. 58.

[CHAPTER IX.]

that is made unanimously, though by very many prelates or other faithful people met together, unless all other requisites, as well as unanimity, to make their prayer to be heard and granted, be observed by them; so that an unanimous prayer is not adequately supposed, and therefore concludes not. But lastly, how far a General Council, if all A. C.'s conditions be observed, is "firm and infallible," that shall be more fully discussed at after.[2] In the meantime, these two words, "firm," and "infallible," are ill put together as synonyms. For there are some things most infallible in themselves, which yet could never get to be made firm among men: and there are many things made firm by law, both in churches and kingdoms, which yet are not infallible in themselves. So to draw all together: to settle controversies in the Church, there is a visible judge and infallible, but not living; and that is the Scripture[3] pronouncing by the Church. And there is

[2] Sect. xxxiii. Consid. 1. p. 264.

[3] And this was thought a sufficient judge, too, when Christians were as humble as learned. I am sure Optatus thought so. Quærendi sunt judices: si Christiani, de utraque parte dari non possunt, quia studiis veritas impeditur. De foris quærendus est judex: si paganus, non potest Christiana nosse secreta; si Judæus, inimicus est Christiani baptismatis: ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri judicium; de cœlo quærendus est judex. Sed ut quid pulsamus ad cœlum, cum habeamus hic in evangelio testamentum? Quia hoc loco recte possunt terrena cœlestibus comparari: tale est quod quivis hominum habens numerosos filios, quamdiu pater præsens est, ipse imperat singulis; non est adhuc necessarium testamentum; sic et Christus, quamdiu præsens in terris fuit, (quamvis nec modo desit,) pro tempore quicquid necessarium erat, apostolis imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus pater, dum se in confinio senserit mortis, timens ne post mortem suam, rupta pace, litigent fratres, adhibitis testibus, voluntatem suam de pectore morituro, transfert in tabulas diu duraturas: et si fuerit inter fratres nata contentio, non itur ad tumulum, sed quæritur testamentum; et qui [in] tumulo quiescit, tacitus de tabulis loquitur. Vivus, cujus est testamentum, in cœlo est: ergo voluntas Ejus, velut in testamento, sic in Evangelio requiratur. [We have got to look for judges. If they are to be Christians they cannot be agreed upon by both sides, because preferences hinder truth. An outside judge then must be found; if he is a pagan, he cannot know the Christian secrets; if he is a Jew, he is the enemy of Christian baptism; therefore no decision can be got about this matter on earth; we must look for a judge from heaven. But why bring the matter to trial to heaven, when we have here a testament or will in the Gospel? Because in this matter earthly things can quite properly be compared with heavenly; it is as if a man had a number of sons, and the father himself gave his commands to each, as long as he is present; so far there is no need of a will. So also Christ, so long as He was present on earth (although in a sense He is not absent now), commanded the apostles in whatever was necessary. But just as an earthly father, when he feels himself on the point of death, fearing lest after his death the peace should be broken and the brothers go to law, before witnesses transfers his wishes from his dying heart to parchments (lit. tablets), which are to last long; and so if a dispute break out between the brothers, they do not go to the grave, but examine the will; and so he, who lies still in the grave, silently speaks from the

a visible and a living judge, but not infallible; and that is a General Council, lawfully called, and so proceeding. But I know no formal confirmation of it needful, though A. C. require it,[4] but

SECTION XXVI.

parchment. He, Whose will we have, is alive and in heaven; therefore let His wishes, just as in a will, be looked for in the Gospel.]—S. Optat. [*de Schism. Donatist.*] *adv. Parmen.* lib. v. [cap. 3. *Op.*, p. 81. ed. Dupin. *ubi sup.* p. 78. note 40.] This pregnant place of Optatus, (that the Scripture is the judge of Divine truth whenever it is questioned,) though Balduin dare not deny, yet he would fain slide by it and by a parallel place as full in St. Augustine in *Psalm* xxi. Enarr. 2. [30. *Op.*, tom. iv. col. 101. F. Migne, iv. 180. Ille sine sensu jacet in monumento, et valent verba ipsius: sedet Christus in cœlo, et contradicitur testamento Ejus? Aperi, legamus. Fratres sumus, quare contendimus? Does the man lie unconscious in the monument, and yet his words hold good: does Christ sit in heaven, and is His will opposed? Open, let us read, we are brothers, wherefore do we strive together?] with this shift that St. Augustine in another place [*de Baptismo*, lib. ii. cap. 7; lib. iv. cap. 6, and lib. v. cap. 23. Migne ix. 133, and 159 and 193] had rather use the testimony of tradition [non tam Scripturam quam traditionem apostolicam, the tradition of the Apostles in preference to Scripture] that is, the testimony *nuncupativi, potius quam scripti, testamenti*—of the nuncupative, rather than the written will of Christ. Balduin. [Annotat.] in S. Optat. lib. v. [*apud Op.*, p. 145. ed Dupin.] But this is a mere shift. First, because it is *petitio principii*, the mere begging of the question. For we deny any testament of Christ but that which is written. And A. C. cannot show it in any one father of the Church, that Christ ever left behind Him a nuncupative obligatory will. Secondly, because nothing is more plain in these two fathers, Optatus and St. Augustine, than that both of them appeal to the written will, and make that the judge, without any exception, when a matter of faith comes in question. In Optatus the words are *habemus in Evangelio*, We have it in the Gospel. And *in Evangelio inquiratur*, Let it be enquired in the Gospel. And Christ put it *in tabulas diu duraturas*, into written and lasting instruments. In St. Augustine the words are: Our Father did not die intestate, etc.; and *tabulæ aperiantur*, Let His will, His written instruments, be opened; and *legantur verba mortui*, Let the words of Him that died be read. And again, *aperi, legamus*; Open the will, and let us read. And *legamus, quid litigamus?* Why do we strive? Let us read the will. And again, *aperi testamentum, lege*; Open the will, read. All which passages are most express and full for His written will, and not for any nuncupative will, as Balduin would put upon us. And Hart, who takes the same way with Balduin, is not able to make it out, as appears by Dr. Rainoldes in his *Conference with Hart*, chap. 8. divis. i. p. 396, etc. [ed. London, 1609.]

[4] Sect. xxviii. No. 1. And so plainly St. Augustine, speaking of St. Cyprian's error about rebaptization, etc., says: Illis temporibus, ante quam plenarii concilii sententia quid in hac re sequendum esset, totius ecclesiæ consensio confirmasset, visum est ei cum [ferme octoginta coepiscopis suis Africanarum ecclesiarum, etc. In those times, before the decree of a General Council had decided what was to be done in this question, and the consent of the whole Church had confirmed it, it seemed right to him with about 80 of his fellow Bishops of African churches, etc.]—*De Baptism, contra Donatist.* lib. i. cap. 18. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 93. G. Migne, ix. 124.] So here is first *sententia concilii*; and then the confirmation of it is *totius ecclesiæ consensio*, the consent of the whole church yielding unto it. And so Gerson: Concurrente universali totius ecclesiæ consensu [implicite, vel explicite, vere vel interpretative. The united agreement of the whole Church concurring implicitly or explicitly, actually or interpretatively.]—*In Declarat. Veritatum, quæ credendæ sunt* [*de necessitate salutis*,] § 4. [inter Gerson. *Op.*, tom.

[CHAPTER IX.]

only that, after it is ended, the whole Church admit it, be it never so tacitly.

A. C. pp. 59, 60.

II. In the next place, A. C. interposes new matter quite out of the Conference. And first, in case of distractions and disunion in the Church, he would know "what is to be done to re-unite, when a General Council" (which is acknowledged a fit judge) "cannot be had by reason of manifold impediments, or if, being called, will not be of one mind? Hath Christ our Lord," saith he, "in this case provided no rule, no judge, infallibly to determine controversies, and to procure unity, and certainty of belief? Indeed, the Protestants admit no infallible means, rule, or judge, but only Scripture, which every man may interpret as he pleases, and so all shall be uncertain." Truly, I must confess, there are many impediments to hinder the calling of a General Council. You know in the ancient Church there was[5] hindrance enough, and what hurt it wrought. And afterward, though it were long first, there was provision made for frequent calling of Councils,[6]

i. col. 22. C. ed. Dupin. Antwerp. 1706.] For this, that the pope must confirm it, or else the General Council is invalid, is one of the Roman novelties. For this cannot be shown in any antiquity void of just exception. The truth is, the pope, as other patriarchs and great bishops used to do, did give his assent to such councils as he approved. But that is no corroboration of the council, as if it were invalid without it, but a declaration of his consenting with the rest. Sect. xxxiii. Consid. 4. No. 6.

[5] [Canones generalium conciliorum] a temporibus Constantini [cœperunt. In præcedentibus namque annis,] persecutione sæviente, [docendarum plebium minime dabatur facultas. Deinde,] Christianitas in diversas hæreses scissa est, quia non erat licentia episcopis in unum convenire, nisi tempore supradicti Imperatoris. [The canons of General Councils began from the days of Constantine. For in the preceding years, when persecution was raging, there was less opportunity to reach the people. Then Christianity was split up into different sects, because the Bishops were not allowed to assemble, until the time of the aforesaid Emperor.]—Isidor. *præfat. in Concil.* [Origo Conciliorum generalium, quo tempore scil. concilia celebrari cœperunt; et de quatuor Conciliis principalibus: Ex Isidoro. *Concil.* tom. i. p. 5.] ed. Venetiis, per Nicolinum, 1585. [This short treatise occurs in the above edition before Isidore's *Preface*, prefixed to the ordinary editions of the Councils.]

[6] Frequens generalium conciliorum celebratio agri Dominici præcipua cultura est. Illorum [vero] neglectus præmissa disseminat atque fovet. Hæc præteritorum temporum recordatio et præsentium consideratio ante oculos nostros ponunt. [Ea propter hoc edicto perpetuo] sancimus, [decernimus atque ordinamus,] ut amodo concilia generalia celebrentur; ita quod primum a fine hujus concilii in quinquennium immediate sequens. Secundum vero a fine illius [mediate sequentis concilii] in septennium, et deinceps in decennium perpetuo celebretur, etc. [The constant holding of General Councils is the chief means of cultivating God's field. . . . The neglect of them spreads and protects the aforementioned weeds (*i.e.* heresies and schisms). This is brought before our eyes by the recollection of past times and the consideration of the present. And for this reason we establish by a perpetual edict, we decree and we ordain that from this time General Councils be held, and

and yet no age since saw them called according to that provision in every circumstance: therefore "impediments" there were enough; or else some declined them wilfully, though there were no impediments. Nor will I deny but that when they were called there were as many practices to disturb or pervert the Councils.[7] And these practices were able to keep many Councils from being all of one mind. But if, being called, they will not be of one mind, I cannot help that; though that very not agreeing is a shrewd sign that the other spirit hath a party there against the Holy Ghost.

III. Now A. C. would know what is to be done for re-uniting of a church divided in doctrine of the faith, when this remedy by a General Council cannot be had. "Sure Christ our Lord," saith he, "hath provided some rule, some judge, in such and such like cases, to procure unity and certainty of belief." I believe so too; for He hath left an infallible rule, the Scripture. And that, by the manifest places in it (which need no dispute, no external judge), is able to settle unity and certainty of belief in necessaries to salvation;[8] and *in non necessariis*, in and about

that the first meet five years from the close of this Council. But the second is to be held seven years from the close of the next following Council, and afterwards a Council shall meet every ten years.]—Concil. Constant. Sess. xxxix. [Octob. 9. an. 1417.] apud Gerson. [*Op.*,] tom. i. p. 230. [ed. Paris. 1606. et, tom. ii. col. 290. B. ed. Dupin.]—Et, Pet. de Aliaco Card. Cameracensis libellum obtulit in Concil. Constant. de Reformatione Ecclesiæ contra opinionem eorum qui putarunt concilia generalia minus necessaria esse, quia omnia bene a patribus nostris ordinata sunt, etc. [And Peter d'Ailly, Cardinal of Cambray, presented a pamphlet in the Council of Constance on the Reform of the Church against the opinion of those who thought that General Councils were now less necessary, because everything was well ordered by our fathers.]—*In fascic. Rerum Expetendarum*, [per Orthuinum Gratium, etc. ed Colon. 1535.] fol. 28. [ccviii.]—Et schismatibus debet ecclesia cito per concilia generalia provideri, ut in primitiva ecclesia docuerunt apostoli, ut *Act.* vi. et *Act.* xv.—*Ibid.* fol. cciv. A. [And the Church ought to be promptly protected against schisms by General Councils, as in the Primitive Church was taught by the apostles, for instance in *Acts* vi. and *Acts* xv.]

[7] In concilio Ariminensi, [propter novitatem verbi minus quam oportuit intellectum, quod tamen fides antiqua pepererat,] multis paucorum fraude deceptis. [In the Council of Rimini, the word (Homoousion) was less well understood than it ought to have been on account of its novelty; though the ancient faith had indeed given it birth; and the many were deceived by the guile of the few.]—S. Augustin. *contra Maximinum Arianum*, lib. iii. [ii.] cap. 14. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 704. E.]

[8] Non per difficiles nos Deus ad beatam vitam quæstiones vocat. In absoluto nobis et facili est æternitas, Jesum [et] suscitatum a mortuis per Deum credere, et Ipsum esse Dominum confiteri. [God does not call us by difficult enquiries to the life of blessedness. On an absolute and simple belief eternity is offered to us—viz., to believe that Jesus was raised from the dead, and to confess that He is Lord.]—S. Hilar. *de Trinitate*, lib. x. ad fin. [sect. 70. *Op.*, col. 1080. E. Migne, ii. 397.

[CHAPTER IX.]

things not necessary, there ought not to be a contention to a separation.[9]

IV. And therefore A. C. does not well, to make that a crime, that the Protestants admit no infallible rule, but the Scripture only: or as he (I doubt, not without some scorn) terms it, beside "only Scripture." For what need is there of another, since this is most infallible; and the same which the ancient Church of Christ admitted?[10] And if it were sufficient for the ancient

[9] [Quomodo ergo non perierunt] Cyprianus et tot collegæ ipsius? qui cum crederent hæreticos et schismaticos baptismum non habere, sine baptismo [tamen] receptis, [cum peccata eorum tam immania tamque sacrilega super eos esse crederent,] eis tamen communicare, quam separari ab unitate maluerunt. [How was it then that Cyprian and so many of his colleagues were not lost? For they, when they believed that heretics and schismatics had no true baptism, preferred to receive them without baptism and to give them communion while they believed their sins still to be very terrible and very sacrilegious on their heads rather than to separate from unity.]—S. Augustin. *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. ii. cap. 6. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 100. B. Migne, ix. 131.]—Cyprianum non contaminabant. [They did not contaminate Cyprian.]—*Ibid. in fin.* [col. 101. D.]

[10] Recensuit cuncta sanctis Scripturis consona. [He decided all things agreeably to the Holy Scriptures.] [*καὶ περὶ τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ὡς παρὰ αὐτοπτῶν τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου παρειληφὼς ὁ Πολύκαρπος, ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς.* And Polycarp having heard about His miracles and about His teaching, as from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, decided all things agreeably to the Scriptures.]—Euseb. [*Eccl.*] *Hist.* lib. v. cap. 20. de Irenæo, [apud *Hist. Eccl. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 239. ed. Reading.]—Paracletus de principali regula agnitus.—Tertullian. *de Monogamia*, cap. 2. *Op.*, p. 526. A. ed. Rigalt.] And this is true, though the author spoke it when he was lapsed.—Ipsas Scripturas apprime tenens. [Holding the Scriptures themselves before all.]—St. Hieron. [*Epist.*] *ad Marcellam contra Montanum*, [xxvii. al. liv.] tom. ii. [*Op.*, tom. iv. par. 2. col. 65. ed. Benedict.]—Hoc quia de scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eadam facilitate contemnitur, qua probatur. [This is as easily condemned as approved, for it has no support from Scripture.]—St. Hieron [*Comment.* lib. iv.] *in Matth.* cap. xxiii. 35. *Op.*, tom. iv. par. i. col. 112.]—Manifestus est fidei lapsus, et liquidum superbiæ vitium, vel respuere aliquid eorum quæ Scriptura habet, vel inducere quicquam quod scriptum non est. [The lapse from faith is evident, and it is a clear fault of pride, either to reject anything contained in Scripture, or to bring in anything which is not written in Scripture.]—S. Basil. *Serm. de Fide*, tom. ii. p. 154. ed Basileæ, 1565. [Migne, iii. 680.]—Contra insurgentes hæreses sæpe pugnavi agraphis, verum non alienis a pia secundum Scripturam sententia.—*Ibid.* p. 153 [*ubi sup.* p. 69. note 18. Against many heresies I have often fought with traditions, but never with traditions foreign to a pious decision built on Scripture.]—And before St. Basil, Tertullian. Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem. [I adore the completeness of Scripture.]—Si non est scriptum, timeat, Væ illud, adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum. [If it is not in Scripture let him be afraid of that anathema aimed at those who add or who take away.]—Tertullian. *advers. Hermog.* cap. xxii. [*Op.*, p. 241. D. ed. Rigalt. Migne, ii. 218.] And Paulinus plainly calls it Regulam directionis. [A rule of direction.] *Epist.* [ii. al.] xiii. [*Op.*, S. Paulini Nolani Episcopi, p. 8. ed Paris. 1685.]—De hac regula tria observanda sunt. 1. Regula est, sed a tempore quo scripta. 2. Regula est, sed per ecclesiam applicanda, non per privatum spiritum. 3. Regula est, et mensurat omnia quæ continet: continet autem omnia necessaria ad salu-

Church to guide them, and direct their councils, why should it be now held insufficient for us, at least till a free General Council may be had? And it hath both the conditions which Bellarmine requires to a rule; namely, that it "be certain, and that it be known; for if it be not certain, it is no rule, and if it be not known, it is no rule to us."[11] Now the Romanists dare not deny, but this rule is "certain";[12] and that it is sufficiently "known" in the manifest places of it, and such as are necessary to salvation, none of the ancients did ever deny; so there is an infallible rule.

V. Nor need there be such fear of a "private spirit" in these manifest things, which being but read, or heard, teach themselves. Indeed, you Romanists had need of some other judge, and he a

tem vel mediate vel immediate. [About this rule three points must be observed. 1. It is a rule, but only from the time in which it was written. 2. It is a rule, but to be applied by the Church, not by a private spirit. 3. It is a rule, and measures all things which it contains, and it contains all things necessary to salvation mediately or immediately.] Et hoc tertium habet [Gabr.] Biel. [And this third point Biel has in] in III. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] unica, Conclus. 4. M.—And this is all we say. Hooker, *Eccl. Polit.* Book V. chap. xxii. [sect. 2, p. 94. ed. Bayne. "The voice and testimony of the Church acknowledging Scripture to be the law of the living God, is for the truth and certainty thereof, no mean evidence . . . a further commodity this custom of public reading of the word of God hath, which is to furnish the very simplest and rudest sort with such infallible axioms and precepts of sacred truth, delivered even in the very letter of the Law of God, as may serve them for rules whereby to judge the better all other doctrines and instructions which they hear."]

[11] Regula Catholicæ fidei certa notaque esse debet: nam si nota non sit, regula nobis non erit; si certa non sit, ne regula quidem erit. [A rule of the Catholic faith ought to be sure and well known; for if it be not known, it will be no rule to us; if it be not sure, it will not be a rule at all.]—Bellarmin. *de Verbo Dei*, lib. i. cap. 2. § 5.—At sacris Scripturis nihil est notius, nihil certius; [ut stultissimum esse necesse sit, qui illis fidem esse habendam neget. But nothing is better known than the Holy Scriptures, nor is anything more sure; so that the man must be very foolish who denies that we must put faith in them.] —Bellarmin. *Ibid.* § 6. [col. 3. D.] Therefore the Holy Scripture is the rule of Catholic faith, both in itself, and to us also; for in things simply necessary to salvation it is abundantly known and manifest, as Sect. xvi. No. 5. [*ubi sup.* pp. 73-75.]

[12] Convenit [autem] inter nos et omnes omnino hereticos, verbum Dei esse regulam fidei; ex qua de dogmatibus judicandum sit: [esse commune principium ab omnibus concessum, unde argumenta ducantur: denique esse gladium spiritualem, qui in hoc certamine recusari non possit. We and all heretics of all kinds agree that the word of God is the rule of faith. From it we must decide our dogmas; we are all agreed that it is the common foundation from which arguments are to be taken; in short, that it is the sword of the Spirit which cannot be rejected in this struggle.]—Bellarmin. in *Præfat. in fin.* [*Op.*,] tom. i. And although there perhaps he includes traditions, yet that was never proved yet. Neither indeed can he include traditions, for he speaks of that word of God, upon which all heretics consent: but concerning traditions, they all consent not, that they are a rule of faith, therefore he speaks not of them.

[CHAPTER IX.] propitious one, to crush the pope's "more powerful principality" out of *Pasce oves*, "Feed my sheep." And yet this must be the meaning (if you will have it), whether Gideon's fleece be wet or dry; that is, whether there be dew enough in the text to water that sense or no. But I pray, when God hath left His Church this infallible rule, what warrant have you to seek another? You have showed us none yet, whatever you think you have. And I hope A. C. cannot think it follows, that Christ our Lord hath provided no rule to determine necessary controversies, because He hath not provided the rule which he would have.

Judges vi.

VI. Besides, let there be such a living judge, as A. C. would have, and let the pope[13] be he; yet that is not sufficient against the malice of the devil, and impious men, to keep the Church at all times from renting, even in the doctrine of faith, or to solder the rents which are made. For *opportet esse hæreses*, "heresies there will be"; and heresies properly there cannot be, but in doctrine of the faith. And what will A. C. in this case do? Will he send Christ our Lord to provide another rule than the decision of the bishop of Rome, because he can neither make unity, nor certainty of belief? And as it is most apparent he cannot do it *de facto*, so neither hath he power from Christ over the whole Church to do it; nay, out of all doubt, it is not the least reason why *de facto* he hath so little success, because *de jure* he hath no power given. But since A. C. requires another judge besides the Scripture, and, in cases when either the time is so difficult that a General Council cannot be called, or, the council so set, that they will not agree, let us see how he proves it.

1 Cor. xi. 19.

A. C. p. 60.

VII. It is thus: "Every earthly kingdom," saith he, "when matters cannot be composed by a parliament, which cannot be called upon all occasions," (Why doth he not add here, "and which being called, will not always be of one mind," as he did add it in case of the council?) "hath, besides the law books, some living magistrates and judges, and above all, one visible king, the highest judge, who hath authority sufficient to end all controversies, and settle unity in all temporal affairs. And shall we think that Christ, the wisest King, hath provided in His Kingdom, the Church, only the law-books of the Holy Scripture, and no living visible judges, and above all, one chief, so assisted by His Spirit, as may suffice to end all controversies for unity and certainty of faith? which can

[13] For so he affirms, [A. C.] p. 58.

never be, if every man may interpret Holy Scripture, the law-books, as he list." This is a very plausible argument with the many, but the foundation of it is but a similitude;[14] and if the similitude hold not in the main, the argument is nothing; and so, I doubt, it will prove here. I will observe particulars, as they lie in order.

VIII. And first, he will have the whole militant Church, for of that we speak, "a kingdom." But this is not certain; for they are no mean ones, which think our Saviour Christ left the Church militant, in the hands of the apostles and their successors, in an aristocratical, or rather, a mixed government; and that the Church is not monarchical,[15] otherwise than the triumphant and militant make one body under Christ the Head. And in this sense indeed, and in this only, the Church is a most absolute kingdom. And the very expressing of this sense is a full answer to all the places

[14] Quæ [autem] subtilissime de hoc disputari possunt, ita ut non similitudinibus quæ plerumque fallunt, sed rebus ipsis satis fiat. [The points which can be most subtly disputed on this question, in such a way that satisfaction can be reached, not by the similitudes which very often prove to have been deceptive, but by the facts themselves;] —S. Augustin. [lib.] *de quantitate animæ*, cap. xxxii. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 433. F.] Whereupon the logicians tell us rightly, that this is a fallacy, unless it be taken *reduplicative*, i.e. *de similibus quæ similia sunt.* And hence Aristotle himself, 2 *Top. Loc.* xxxii. says: πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων, εἰ ὁμοίως ἔχει· (rursum in similibus, si similiter se habent.) [Again in like things, if they are really like.]

[15] When Gerson wrote his tract *De Auferibilitate Papæ*, sure he thought the Church might continue in a very good being, without a monarchical head; therefore, in his judgment, the Church is not by any command or institution of Christ, monarchical. Gerson. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 209. ed. Dupin.] par. 1. p. 154. [ed. 1606.]

When St. Jerome wrote thus [proving the equality of each bishop in power]: Ubicunque fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii; sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii; sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. [Wherever he is bishop, whether of Rome or of Eugubium; whether of Constantinople or of Rhegium; whether of Alexandria or of Tanis, he has the same weight, he has the same place in the hierarchy.] —S. Hieron. *Epist.* [*ad Evangelum, al.*] *Evagrium*, [cii. *Op.*, tom. iv. par. 2. col. 803.] doubtless he thought not of the Roman bishop's monarchy. For what bishop is of the same merit, or of the same degree in the priesthood, with the pope, as things are now carried at Rome?—Affirmamus etiam, patribus, et Græcis et Latinis, ignotas esse voces de Petro aut Papa monarcha et monarchia. Nam quod in superioribus observabamus, reperiri eas dictiones positas pro episcopo et episcopatu, nihil hoc ad rem facit. [We further assert that the phrases about Peter or the Pope being monarch, and having a monarchy, were unknown to the Fathers both Greeks and Latins. For the fact which we have noted in earlier passages that those expressions (*i.e.* monarch and monarchy) are to be found used for bishop and for bishopric, is not to the point at all.]—Isaacus Casaubon. *Exercitatione* xv. *ad Annales Ecclesiasticos*, Baronii, § xii. p. 378. [p. 272. ed. Francof. 1615.] et § xi. p. 360. [*ibid.* pp. 256-262.] diserte asserit et probat ecclesiæ regimen aristocraticum fuisse. [He luminously asserts and proves that the government of the Church was aristocratic.]

[CHAPTER IX.]

of Scripture, and other arguments brought by Bellarmine,[16] to prove that the Church is a monarchy. But the Church being as large as the world, Christ thought it fitter to govern it aristocratically—by divers, rather than by one viceroy. And I believe this is true: for all the time of the first three hundred years, and somewhat better, it was governed aristocratically, if we will impartially consider, how the bishops of those times carried the whole business of admitting any new consecrated bishops or others to, or rejecting them from, their communion. For I have carefully examined this for the first six hundred years, even to and within the time of St. Gregory the Great;[17] who, in the beginning of the seventh hundred year, sent such letters to Augustine, then archbishop of Canterbury, and to Quirinus,[18] and other bishops in Ireland. And I find, that the *literæ communicatoriæ*, which certified from one great patriarch to another who were fit or unfit to be admitted to their communion, if they upon any occasion repaired to their sees, were sent mutually; and as freely, and in the same manner, from Rome to the other patriarchs, as from them to it. Out of which I think this will follow most directly, That the Church government then was aristocratical. For had the bishop of Rome been then accounted sole monarch of the Church, and been put into the definition of the Church, as he is now by Bellarmine,[19] all these communicatory letters should have been directed from

[16] Bellarmin. *de Concili* [*orum auctoritate*,] lib. ii. cap. 16. § 1, 2, 3. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 93. C.]

[17] S. Gregor. [Magn. *Registr.*] *Epistol.* lib. ix. *Epist.* lviii. [lib. xi. Indict. 4. *Epist.* xxviii. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1109. E. Migne, iii. 1318.]—Et, lib. xii. *Epist.* xv. [lib. xi. Indict. 4. *Epist.* lxiv., lxv. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1150. B. *et seqq.* Migne, iii. 1183.]

[18] S. Gregor. [Magn. *Registr. Epistol.*] lib. ix. *Epist.* lxi. [lib. xi. Indict. 4. *Epist.* lxvii. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1166. D. Migne, iii. 1204. This epistle the Benedictine editors and Migne, following the authority of Peter de Marca, Cardinal Bona, and others, inscribe Quirico, et cæteris episcopis in *Hiberia*—not *Hibernia*—Catholicis. It seems impossible that the epistle could have been addressed to any Irish bishops, not only because its subject is the reception of Nestorians into the Church, while the heresy of Nestorius does not appear to have extended beyond the Oriental Church; but because an allusion is made to the fact, that the legate of the bishops, to whom St. Gregory was addressing himself, had lost certain letters at Jerusalem.]

[19] Nostra autem [sententia est, Ecclesiam unam tantum esse, non duas, et illam unam et veram esse cætum hominum ejusdem Christianæ fidei professione, et eorundem sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum, ac præcipue unius Christi in terris Vicarii Romani Pontificis. But our conclusion is that there is only one Church, not two; and that the one and true Church is the assembly of men, bound together by the confession of the true Christian faith, and by the communion of the same sacraments, under the rule of lawful pastors, and chiefly of the one vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pope.]—Bellarmin. *de Ecclesia Militante*, lib. iii. cap. 2. § 9. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 108. D.]

him to the rest, as whose admittance ought to be a rule for all to communicate; but not from others to him, or at least not in that even, equal, and brotherly way, as now they appear to be written. For it is no way probable that the bishops of Rome, which even then sought their own greatness too much, would have submitted to the other patriarchs voluntarily, had not the very course of the Church put it upon them.

IX. Besides, this is a great and undoubted rule, given by Optatus,[20] "That wheresoever there is a Church, there the Church is in the commonwealth, not the commonwealth in the Church. And so also the Church was in the Roman empire." Now from this ground I argue thus: If the Church be within the empire or other kingdom, it is impossible the government of the Church should be monarchical. For no emperor or king will endure another king within his dominion that shall be greater than himself, since the very enduring it makes him that endures it, upon the matter, no monarch. Nor will it disturb this argument, that two great kings in France and Spain[21] permit this. For he that is not blind may see, if he will, of what little value the pope's power is in those kingdoms, farther than to serve their own turns of him, which they do to their great advantage. Nay, farther, the ancient canons and fathers of the Church seem to me plain for this, for the Council of Antioch[22] submits ecclesiastical causes to the bishops. And what was done amiss by a bishop, was corrigible by a synod of bishops,[23] but this with the metropolitan.[24] And in case these

[20] *Non enim respublica est in ecclesia: sed ecclesia in republica:* id est, in imperio Romano. [The State is not in the Church, but the Church is in the State; and that State is the Roman Empire.]—S. Optat. [Milevit.] lib. iii. [cap. 3. *Op.*, p. 52. *ubi sup.* p. 201. note 58.]

[21] [By arrangement with the Pope these kings nominated all the French and Spanish bishops.]

[22] Concil. Antioch. [an. 341.] Can. ix. p. 507. [*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 565. A. Τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας· κ. τ. λ. The bishop presiding in the metropolis ought to know the bishops in each province, and to undertake the charge of the whole province.]

[23] Conc. Nicæn. I. [an. 325.] Can. v. [*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 32. B. ἵνα κοινῇ πάντων τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένων, τὰ τοιαῦτα ζητήματα ἐξετάζοι· κ. τ. λ. In order that all the bishops of the province being assembled together by common consent, such questions may be thoroughly examined by him.]—Et, Concil. Antioch. Can. xii. [*ubi sup.* col. 568. A. εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου καθαιρεθείς . . . . δέον ἐπὶ μείζονα ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον τρέπεσθαι . . . . προσαναφέρειν πλείοσιν ἐπισκόποις· κ. τ. λ. If any one has been condemned by his own bishop . . . . he ought to appeal to a larger assembly of bishops . . . . to refer the matter for advice to more bishops.]

[24] Concil. Nicæn. I. Can. iv. [*ubi sup.* col. 30. E. τὸ δὲ κῦρος τῶν γινομένων δίδοσθαι καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ. But the confirmation of what is done should be given in each province to the metropolitan.]

[CHAPTER IX.]

did not agree, the metropolitan[25] might call in other bishops out of the neighbouring provinces. And if things settled not this way, a General Council, under the Scripture,[26] and directed by it, was the highest remedy. And St. Cyprian, even to Pope Cornelius himself, says plainly, that "to every bishop is ascribed a portion of the flock for him to govern."[27] And so not all committed to one. In all this the government of the Church seems plainly aristocratical. And if all other arguments fail, we have one left from Bellarmine, who opposes it as much as any, twice for failing.[28] And yet, where he goes to exclude secular princes from the Church government, all his quotations[29] and all his proofs run upon this head to show "that the government of the Church was ever in the bishops." What says A. C. now to the confession of this great adversary, and in this great point, extorted from him by force of truth? Now if this be true, then the whole foundation of this argument is gone. The Church militant is no kingdom, and therefore not to be compared or judged by one; the resemblance will not hold.

A. C. pp. 64, 65.

X. Next, suppose it a kingdom; yet the Church militant remaining one, is spread in many earthly kingdoms, and cannot

—Et, Concil. Antioch. Can. ix. [*ubi sup.* col. 565. C. *περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου· κ. τ. λ.* But he must try to do nothing further without the metropolitan bishop, etc.]

[25] Concil. Antioch. Can. xiv. [*ubi sup.* col. 568. D. *εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπί τισιν ἐγκλήμασιν κρίνοιτο, ἔπειτα συμβαίη περὶ αὐτοῦ διαφωνεῖν τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπους, τῶν μὲν ἀθῴον τὸν κρινόμενον ἀποφαινόντων, τῶν δὲ ἔνοχον· ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς πάσης ἀμφιβητήσεως, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τὸν τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἀπὸ τῆς πλησιοχώρου ἐπαρχίας μετακαλεῖσθαι ἑτέρους τινὰς τοὺς ἐπικρινοῦντας, καὶ τὴν ἀμφισβήτησιν διαλύσοντας, τοῦ βεβαιῶσαι σὺν τοῖς τῆς ἐπαρχίας τὸ παριστάμενον.* If any bishop be tried on certain charges, and the provincial bishops happen to disagree about him, some declaring the accused to be innocent and some guilty, for escape from the difficulty, it is decided by the Holy Council that the metropolitan shall call in the other bishops from the neighbouring province, who shall decide and settle the difficulty, in order to complete the matter in hand, together with the bishops of the province.]

[26] Scripturam canonicam præponi, etc. [That the canonical Scripture be set first.]—S. Augustin. *de Baptismo contra Donatist.* lib. ii. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 98. A. Migne, ix. 128.]

[27] Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, etc., et singulis pastoribus portio gregis [sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus, etc. For since a portion has been appointed to all of us; and every pastor (bishop) has a portion of the flock allotted to him; let each rule and direct this portion, having to render to the Lord an account of his work.]—S. Cyprian, lib. i. Ep. 3. [*Epist.* lv. *ad Cornelium*, p. 86. ed. Benedict.]

[28] Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. i. cap. 8. [in tit. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 526. D.]—Et, Id. *de Concili* [*orum auctoritate,*] lib. ii. cap. 16. [in tit. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 93. C.]

[29] Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. i. cap. 7. [in tit. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 522. D.]

well be ordered like any one particular kingdom.[30] And therefore, though in one particular kingdom there be many visible judges and one supreme, yet it follows not that in the universal militant Church there must be one supreme. For how will he enter to execute his office, if the kings of those kingdoms will not give leave?

XI. Now here, though A. C. expresses himself no farther, yet I well know what he and his fellows would be at. They would not be troubled to ask leave of any several kings in their several dominions. No; they would have one emperor over all the kings, as well as one pope over all the bishops. And then you know who told us of "two great lights to govern the world, the sun and the moon—that is, the pope and the emperor."[31] At the

[30] [Et ideo] licet sit expediens, quod uni populo partiali fideli præsit unus episcopus, non expedit tamen quod toti populo fideli præsit unus solus. Tum quia omnia negotia unius populi partialis potest sustinere unus solus; nullus autem unus potest sustinere omnia negotia etiam majora omnium Christianorum: tum quia minus malum est, ut populus partialis et parvus inficiatur ab uno episcopo, quam ut totus, vel fere totus, populus Christianus inficiatur ab uno capite, quod omnibus præsit. [Though it may be expedient that each particular body of faithful people be governed by one bishop, it is certainly not expedient that the whole body of the faithful be governed by one. Because, first, while one by himself can undertake all the affairs of one particular body of people, no single man can undertake all the business, having to do with such great matters, of all Christians; and, secondly, because less harm is done if one particular and small body be corrupted by one bishop, than that the whole, or nearly the whole, body of Christians be corrupted by one head who is chief over all.]—Ockam. *Dial.* lib. ii. tract. i. par. 3. cap. 30. ad 8. [apud Goldast. *S. Rom. Imper. Monarch.* tom. ii. pp. 818, 819. ed. Francof. 1614. These dialogues are, according to Thorold (T. C., *Laud's Labyrinth*, p. 254.) in the *Index Expurgatorius.*] And besides this of Ockam, to that common argument, That monarchical government is the best, and therefore undoubtedly that which Christ instituted for His Church, it is sufficient to answer, That a monarchy is the best form of government in one city or country. Aristot. *Ethic.* [*Nicom.*] lib. viii. cap. 10. [τούτων δὲ βελτίστη μὲν ἡ βασιλεία . . . παρέκβασις δὲ βασιλείας μὲν τυραννὶς· ἄμφω γὰρ μοναρχίαι. Now of these the best is the rule of a king; but the corruption of the rule of a king is the rule of a tyrant; for both are monarchies (*i.e.* the rule of one).—*Op.*, tom. ix. p. 166. ed. Bekker.] But it follows not, that it is the best in respect of the whole world, where the parts are so remote, and the dispositions of men so various. And therefore Bellarmine himself confesses, Monarchiam aristocratiæ et democratiæ admixtam utiliorem esse in hac vita, quam simplex monarchia est. [A monarchy combined with aristocracy and democracy is more practically useful in this life than a pure monarchy.]—[Bellarmin.] *de Rom. Pont.* lib. i. cap. 3. § 1. Bellarmine's words are: Regimen temperatum ex omnibus tribus formis, propter naturæ humanæ corruptionem, utilius est, quam simplex monarchia, etc. A mode of government combined out of all three forms is more practically useful, because of the corrupt state of human nature, than a pure monarchy.]

[31] In the first gloss, ascribed to Isidore, in *Gen.* i. 16, it is, Per solem intelligitur regnum; per lunam, sacerdotium. By the sun is figured royalty, by the moon the hierarchy. [This

[CHAPTER IX.]

first it began with more modesty—the emperor and the pope; and that was somewhat tolerable. For St. Augustine tells us,[32] "that the militant Church is often in Scripture called the moon, both for the many changes it hath, and for its obscurity in many times of its peregrination." And he tells us too, "that if we will understand this place of Scripture in a spiritual sense, our Saviour Christ is the sun, and the militant Church, as being full of changes in her estate, the moon."[33] But now it must be a triumphant Church here—militant no longer. The pope must be the sun, and the emperor but the moon. And lest Innocent's own power should not be able to make good his Decretal, Gaspar Schioppius[34] doth

passage does not occur literally either in the *Gloss. Ordinar.* or in St. Isidore *in Genesin*, from which it is taken. There is one passage of St. Isidore cited from him as the Gloss on *Gen.* i. 19.: Splendor siquidem solis regni figurat excellentiam, plebem obtemperantem regi lunæ splendor ostendit, tanquam synagogam. Stellæ vero principes ejus sunt, etc. If indeed, the glory of the sun represents the excellence of royalty; the glory of the moon portrays the people obeying the king, exhibiting them as if they were a synagogue (*i.e.* an organised body for worship). But the stars are his princes, etc. This last place is slightly varied from St. Isidore's *Comment. in Genesin*, cap. ii. *Op.*, tom. v. p. 266. ed. Lorenzanæ; et, cap. iii. p. 285. A. ed. Colon. 1617.] But Innocent the Third, almost six hundred years after Isidore's death, perverts both text and gloss, thus: Ad firmamentum [igitur] coeli, hoc est, universalis ecclesiæ, fecit Deus duo magna luminaria, id est, duas instituit dignitates, quæ sunt pontificalis auctoritas et regalis potestas. Ut quanta [est] inter solem et lunam, tanta inter pontifices et reges differentia cognoscatur. [For the firmament of heaven, that is of the universal Church, God made two great lights; that is, He appointed two offices, which are the authority of the pope and the power of the king . . . so that men might know that the difference between pope and king is like the difference between sun and moon.]—*Epist. ad Imperat. Constantinopolitanum*, [an. 1198.] Decret. [al. Gregor. IX.] lib. i. *de Majoritate et Obedientia*, tit. 33. cap. [6.] Solitæ.

[32] Propter mutabilitatem, lunæ nomine in scripturis signatur. — S. Augustin. *Epist.* cxix. cap. 6. [*ad inquisitiones Januarii*, lib. ii. seu *Epist.* lv. cap. 6. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 131. E. Migne, ii. 209.]

[33] [Fecit lunam in tempora:] Intelligimus spiritualiter ecclesiam. Et hic quis sol, nisi sol [ille] justitiæ.—S. Augustin. in *Ps.* ciii. [Enarr. Sermo iii. 19. *Op.*, tom. iv. col. 1163. B. Migne, iv. 1373. Cf. Enarr. in *Ps.* x. *ibid.* col. 59. C.]

[34] Gasp[ar] Schiop[pius, *in*] *L*[*ibro*] *dicto Ecclesiasticus*, [auctoritati Serenissimi D. Jacobi Magnæ Britanniæ Regis oppositus.] cap. 145. [Schioppius is meeting an argument derived from Pope Innocent's words, against the union of spiritual and temporal supremacy in the Pope. The points of correspondence which he incidentally gives are these: Sicut luna proprium lumen non habet, sed id a sole mutuatur: sic etiam sæculari potestati spiritualis auctoritatem præbet, cum ei etiam propter conscientiam subditos esse jubet. Et sicut luna videtur luminare magnum cum tamen multis stellarum minor sit; similiter sæcularis potestas amplissima videtur, cum tamen sacerdotio longe sit inferior. Just as the moon has no light of its own, but borrows it from the sun, so also the spiritual power lends authority to the temporal, since it commands men to be subject to it for conscience sake. And as the moon seems a great luminary, though it is smaller than many of the stars, likewise the secular power seems very large, though it is really far inferior to the hierarchy.—P. 527. ed. Hartbergæ, 1611.]

not only avow the allusion or interpretation, but is pleased to express many circumstances, in which he would fain make the world believe the resemblance holds. And lest any man should not know how much the pope is made greater than the emperor by this comparison, the Gloss[35] furnishes us with that too, and tells us "that by this it appears, that since the earth is seven times greater than the moon, and the sun eight times greater than the earth, it must needs follow, that the pope's power is forty-seven times greater than the emperor's." I like him well—he will make odds enough. But what, doth Innocent the Third give no reason of this his Decretal? Yes. And it is, saith he, "because the sun, which rules in the day, that is, in spiritual things, is greater than the moon, which rules but in the night, and in carnal things."[36] But is it possible that Innocentius the Third, being so wise and so able, as "that nothing which he did, or commended, or disproved in all his life, should after his death be thought fit to be changed,"[37] could think that such an allusion of spiritual things to the day, which the sun governs, and worldly business to the night, which the moon governs, should carry weight enough with it to depress imperial power lower than God hath made it? Out of doubt he could not; for he well knew that *omnis anima*, "every soul" was to "be subject to the higher power." And "the higher power"[38] there mentioned, is the

Rom. xiii. 1

[35] Igitur cum terra sit septies major luna, sol autem octies major terra; restat ergo ut pontificalis dignitas quadragesies septies sit major regali dignitate. Therefore since the earth is seven times greater than the moon, and the sun eight times greater than the earth, it is found that the papal dignity is 47 times greater than the royal.—*Gloss. in Decret. prædict.* Where, first, the Gloss is out in his Latin: he might have said *quadragies*, for *quadragesies* is no word. Next, he is out in his arithmetic; for eight times seven makes not forty-seven, but fifty-six; and then he is much to blame for drawing down the pope's power from fifty-six to forty-seven. [The margin of the Gloss adds: *Alias*, quinquagies septies;—of which the arithmetic is also open to Laud's remark.] And, lastly, this allusion hath no ground of truth at all; for the emperor being *solo Deo minor*, inferior to God alone (Tertul. *ad Scap.*) cannot be a moon to any other sun.—[Tertullian.) *ad Scap.* cap. ii. *Op.*, p. 69. Migne, i. 700.]

[36] Sed illa potestas, quæ præest diebus, *i.e.* in spiritualibus, major est; quæ vero carnalibus, minor. [But that is the greater power which rules over the days, *i.e.* spiritual things; that is the lesser which rules over carnal things.]—Innocent. III. *ubi sup.* [p. 234. note 31.]

[37] [Cujus vita adeo probata fuit,] ut post ejus mortem, nil earum rerum, quæ in vita egerit, laudaverit, improbaveritque, immutatum sit. [Whose life was so excellent, that after his death nothing which he had done, had praised or had condemned, was altered.]—Platina in vita Innocent. III. [*Vit. Pontific.* p. 214.]

[38] Patres veteres, et præsertim Augustin. *Epist.* liv. [*ad Macedonium*, et Chrysostomus (v. infra,) præsenti loco,] Apostolum interpretantur de potestate sæculari tantum loqui, quod et ipse textus subindicat, etc. [The ancient fathers and especially Augus-

[CHAPTER IX.]

temporal. And the ancient fathers[39] come in with a full consent, that *omnis anima*, "every soul," comprehends there all without any exception; all spiritual men, even to the highest bishop, and in spiritual causes too, so the foundations of faith and good manners be not shaken; and where they are shaken, there ought to be prayer and patience, there ought not to be opposition by force. Nay, he knew well, that emperors and kings[40] are *custodes*

tine and Chrysostom, interpret the Apostle as speaking only of the temporal power, and this the text itself suggests.]—Salmeron. Disput. iv. in *Rom.* xiii. § [5. Salmeron. *Comment.* etc. tom. xiii. p. 676.]

[39] πᾶσι ταῦτα διατάττεται, καὶ ἱερεῦσι, [καὶ μοναχοῖς, οὐχὶ τοῖς βιωτικοῖς μόνον, ἐκ προοιμίων αὐτὸ δῆλον ἐποίησεν οὕτω λέγων· πᾶσα ψυχή, κ.τ.λ. κἂν ἀποστόλος ᾖς, κἂν εὐάγγελιστής, κἂν προφήτης, κἂν ὁστισοῦν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνατρέπει τὴν εὐσέβειαν αὕτη ἡ ὑποταγή.] Omnibus ista imperantur, et sacerdotibus, et monachis, etc. Etiamsi apostolus sis, si evangelista, si propheta, sive quisquis tandem fueris. [This is a command laid on all, not only on secular people, but also on priests and monks, and he has made this clear by his beginning. Every soul, etc., even if he is an Apostle, an Evangelist, a Prophet, or holds any other position; for this obedience does not overthrow his piety towards God.]—S. Chrysostom. [in *Epist.*] *ad Rom. Homil.* xxiii. [1. *Op.*, tom. ix. p. 686. B.]—Sive est sacerdos [aliquis,] sive antistes, etc.—Theodoret. in Rom. xiii. [εἴτε ἱερεύς τις ἐστιν, εἴτε ἀρχιερεύς, εἴτε τὸν μονήρη βίον ἐπαγγελλόμενος, τοῖς τὰς ἀρχὰς πεπιστευμένοις εἰκέτω. Whether he be priest or high priest, or professing the solitary life (*i.e.* hermits), let him obey them entrusted with the rule over him.]—Theodoret. *Op.*, tom. iii. p. 99. D. ed. Paris. 1642.]—[Omnis anima (inquit *Rom.* xiii. 1.) potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit.] Si omnis et vestra. Quis vos excipit ab universitate? Ipsi sunt qui vobis dicere solent, servate vestræ sedis honorem. Christus aliter et jussit et gessit. [He says every soul in *Rom.* xiii. 1. If every soul, you are included. Who makes you an exception from what is universal? They are those who are wont to say to you, preserve the honour of your See. But Christ both commanded and acted otherwise.]—S. Bernard. *Epist.* xlii. *ad Henricum Senonensem Archiepiscopum*, [*Op.*, fol. 199. col. 4. M. ed. Paris. 1551.]—And, Theophylact. in *Rom.* xiii. [παιδεύων πᾶσαν ψυχὴν, κἂν ἱερεὺς ᾖ τις, κἂν μοναχὸς, κἂν ἀπόστολος, ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς ἄρχουσιν. Instructing every soul, even if he be priest or monk or apostle, to be in subjection to rulers. Theophylact. in *Epist. D. Pauli Comment.* ed. Lindsell. Londin. 1636.] Where it is very observable, that Theophylact lived in the time of Pope Gregory the Seventh, and St. Bernard after it, and yet this truth obtained then; and this was about the year 1130.

[40] An forte de religione fas non est ut dicat imperator, vel quos miserit imperator? cur ergo ad imperatorem vestri venere legati? cur eum fecerunt causæ suæ judicem, non secuturi quod ille judicaret? [Or is it perhaps not right before God that the Emperor should speak on a religious question or those whom the Emperor has sent?] Well, why did your representatives come to the Emperor? Why did they make him judge of their cause if they did not mean to follow what he decided?]—S. Augustin. *contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, lib. i. cap. 9. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 20. D. Migne, ix. 44.]—[Sed quorsum ista dicuntur?] numquidnam, etiam si obtineant non pertinere ad imperatorem adversus eos aliquid statuere, qui prava in religione sectantur, [propterea si interfecerit eos, quos punierit martyres erunt? But with what view are those words spoken? Supposing they gain their point that the Emperor has no right to make laws against people who belong to a corrupt religion; then if he should kill them, will those whom he punished be martyrs?]—*Ibid.*

SECTION XXVI.

utriusque tabulæ, "they, to whom the custody and preservation of both tables of the law," for worship to God and duty to man, "are committed"; that a book of the law was, by God's own command in Moses' time, to be given the king; that the kings under that law, but still according to it, did proceed to necessary reformations in Church businesses; and therein commanded the very priests themselves, as appears in the acts of Hezekiah and Josiah, who yet were never censured, to this day, for usurping the high priest's office. Nay, he knew full well, that the greatest emperors for the Church's honour—Theodosius the Elder,[41] and Justinian,[42] and Charles the Great,[43] and divers others—did not only meddle now and then, but did enact laws, to the great settlement and increase of religion in their several times.[44] But then, if this could not be the reason why Innocentius made this strange allusion, what was? Why, truly, I will tell you: The pope was now grown to a great and a firm height. Gregory the Seventh[45] had set the popedom upon a broad

Deut. xvii. 18.

2 Chron. xxix. 4. 2 Kings xxiii. 2.

[col. 20. E.] Nor can this be said to be usurpation in the Emperor. For elsewhere St. Augustine speaks thus: Imperator ad cujus curam, de qua rationem Deo redditurus esset, res illa maxime pertinebat. [Arbitrum enim et judicem causæ traditionis et schismatis illi cum fecerant, etc. The Emperor to whose charge this matter specially belongs, for he must render account to God for it. For they had made him the arbiter and judge of this suit about tradition and schism.] —S. Augustin. *Epist.* clxii. [*Epist.* xliii. *ad Glorium et Eleusium*, etc. cap. 4. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 93. G. Migne, ii. 163.] and, Quis mente sobrius regibus dicat, Nolite curare in regno vestro a quo teneatur, vel oppugnetur, ecclesia Domini vestri: [non ad vos pertineat, in regno vestro quis velit esse sive religiosus, sive sacrilegus: quibus dici non potest, Non ad vos pertineat, in regno vestro quis velit pudicus esse, quis impudicus? What man in his senses will declare to kings, Take no thought who holds or attacks the Church of God in your kingdom. It is no affair of yours which of your subjects chooses to be religious, or which sacrilegious. Could you not say to them, (if they grant this) it is no business of yours who is chaste among your subjects or who is unchaste?—S. Augustin. *Epist.* iv. [lib. *de correctione Donatist.* seu *Epist.* clxxxv. *ad Bonifacium*, cap. 5. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 651. E. Migne, ii. 301.] Antiquitas recte dixit, Magistratus est custos legis, scilicet primæ et secundæ tabulæ, quod ad disciplinam attinet. [The ancients said rightly, the magistrates are the guardians of the Law, both of the first and of the second table in all matters of discipline.]—*Confessio Saxonica*, cap. xxiii. [*apud Syllog. Confess.* p. 314. ed. Oxon. 1827.]—Et Gerhardus, *Locor. Theologor.* [loc. xxv. par. 2.] cap. 7. § 5. membr. 1. [tom. xiv. p. 24. ed. Tubingæ, 1776.] probat ex *Deut.* xvii. 18. [Gerhardus proves this from *Deut.* xvii. 18.]

[41] [Emperor, 378-395 A.D.]

[42] [Emperor, 527-565 A.D.]

[43] [Emperor of West, 800-819. See Milman, *Latin Christianity*, Book v. chapter i.]

[44] [Note A at end of chapter.]

[45] [Illud tantum dicam] hunc maximum pontificem, totius ecclesiasticæ libertatis unicum assertorem [fuisse, qui quanquam vir sanctissimus esset, etc. I will say no more than that this Supreme Pontiff was a remarkable defender of all ecclesiastical liberties, and although he was a very

[Chapter IX.]

bottom, before this Innocent's time; so that now it is the less wonder if he make so bold with the emperor as to depress him as low as the moon, upon no better ground than a groundless resemblance. But beside this prime reason, there are divers others, which may easily be drawn out of the same resemblance. For, since Innocentius' main aim was to publish the pope's greatness over kings and emperors, why doth he not tell us that the pope is as the sun, and the emperor as the moon? because, as the moon borrows all her light from the sun, so the emperor borrows all his true light from the pope; or because, as the moon still increases in light so long as she follows the sun, but so soon as ever she steps before the sun she wanes presently and her light decreases, so the emperor, so long as he is content to follow the pope, and do all that he would have him, his light and his power increase; but if he do but offer to step before, though that be his proper place, then his light, and honour, and power, and all decrease. And this Pope Gregory the Seventh made too good upon the Emperor Henry the Fourth: and Pope Adrian the Fourth,[46] and Alexander the Third,[47] and Lucius the Third,[48] with some others, upon Frederick Barbarossa.[49] And some other emperors were alike served, where they did not submit. And I hope no man will blame the pope's holiness for this. For if the emperors kept the popes under for divers years together—whereas Bellarmine[50] tells us it was against all right they should

holy man, etc.]—Onuph. [*Annotat.*] in Platin. in vit. Gregor. VII. [apud Platin. *Vit. Pontific.* p. 177.] For, taking occasion by the war which Henry the Fourth had with the Saxons and their neighbours, and the complaint of the Saxons made to the pope, (of which Platina in the *Life of Gregory the Seventh*,) the pope, wise enough for his own advantages, sought not only to free himself from the emperor, but to make the emperor subject to him; and for this the history is plain enough.

[46] [Pope, 1154.]

[47] [Pope, 1159.]

[48] [Pope, 1181.]

[49] [Emperor of West, 1152-1190 A.D.]

[50] Summus pontifex Regis regum vicarius imperatoribus terrenis jure subditus non erat, sed tum quia potestas ejus nota non erat, sed tum quia potestas ejus nota non erat [imperatoribus paganis,] tum quia viribus temporalibus destitutus erat, vellet nollet, [ut dixi,] subjectus esse cogebatur. [The supreme Pontiff, the Vicar of the King of kings, had not been lawfully made subject to earthly emperors; but since his power was not known by the pagan emperors, and since he was without temporal forces, therefore whether he liked or not he was, as I have said, obliged to submit to them.]—Bellarmin. *in Apologia* [*pro responsione ad librum Jacobi regis, cujus titulus est, Triplici nodo triplex cuneus, etc.* cap.] xv. *Respons. ad mendacium* x. [(p. 37.) *Op.*, tom. vii. col. 818. B. ed. Colon. 1617.] And Bellarmine is at the same argument for deposing of kings too. Quod si Christiani [olim non deposuerunt Neronem, et Diocletianum, et Julianum Apostatam, ac Valentem Arianum, et similes, id fuit] quia deerant vires temporales Christianis. [But

so do, the pope being never rightfully subject unto them—I hope the pope, having now got power enough, may keep the emperors under, and not suffer them any more to step before the sun, lest like moons as they are, they lose all their light. Or because, as the moon is but *vicaria solis*, "the vicar or substitute of the sun," as Philo[51] tells, so the emperor, at least in all spiritual causes, is but the pope's substitute, and that for the night, that his holiness may sleep the quieter on the other side of the sphere. Or, lastly, if you will abuse the Scripture, as you too often do, and as Innocentius did in the Decretal very grossly, you may say it is because the woman, which all grant represented the Church, is "clothed with the sun," that is, with the glorious rays of the pope, and had the moon, that is, the emperor,[52] under her feet. For this is as good, as literal, as proper interpretation of these words, as that of Innocentius is of the words, "God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the less to rule the night." Thus, he or you may give your wits leave to play, if you will, for the pope's Decretal is a mere fancy. But the true reason, indeed, why Innocentius made it, was that above mentioned. He was now in that greatness, that he thought he might pass anything upon the Christian world, that pleased him; and was therefore resolved to bring it into the body of the Canon, that aftertimes might have a law to legitimate and make good their predecessors' usurpation over emperors and kings. And rather than fail of this, he would not spare the abusing of Scripture itself. Where, by the way, dares A. C. say this pope did not err *in cathedra* when he was so dazzled between the sun and the moon, that he wanted light in the midst of it to expound Scripture? Well, I would have the Jesuits leave their practising, and remember: First, that one emperor will not always be able to establish and preserve one

SECTION XXVI.

Rev. xii. 1.

Gen. i. 16.

if the Christians did not in the former times depose Nero and Diocletian, and Julian the Apostate, and the Arian Valens and their like, this was because the Christians were without temporal power.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. v. cap. 7. [§ 13. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 904. B.] Now this is a most loud untruth, as appears in Tertullian, who lived about the year 200, under Severus. And the Christians then had strength enough against the emperor, had they had right enough with it.

[51] [σελήνην δ' ὑπηρέτην καὶ διάδοχον ἡλίου, κ.τ.λ. The moon is the servant and the substitute of the sun. —Philo Jud.] *de Monarch.* lib. [i. cap. 1. *Op.*, p. 812. D. ed. Paris. 1640.]

[52] Sic enim Alexander Tertius collum Friderici Primi pede comprimebat, et dixit, Scriptum est, Super aspidem et basiliscum, etc. [So also Alexander III. pressed his foot on the neck of Frederic I., and said, It is written, Thou shall tread on the asp and the basilisk.]—Jo. Nauclerus, *Chron. Generatione* xl. circa an. 1170. [vol. iii. p. 235.]

[CHAPTER IX.]

only uniform practice and exercise of religion. Secondly, that, supposing he both can and will so do, yet the Jesuits cannot be certain that that one uniform exercise of religion shall be the Roman Catholic. And thirdly, that as there is a body of earth, a world of confusion, to eclipse their moon, the emperor, so in the same way, and by like interposition, the moon, when it is grown too near in conjunction, may eclipse their sun, the pope. And there is no great doubt but he will, considering what some great kings make of the pope's power at this day, when it pleases them.

XII. And since we are in this comparison between the sun and the moon, give me leave a little farther to examine, who A. C. and his fellow Jesuits, with some others, would have to be this one emperor. I am not willing to meddle with any the secret designs of foreign states; but if they will express their designs in print, or publish them by great and full authority, I hope then it shall neither be unlawful nor unfit for me either to take notice or to make use of them. Why, then, you may be pleased to know, they would have another translation of the empire from Germany to Spain. They think, belike, this emperor's[53] line, though in the same house, is not Catholic enough. And if you ask me how I know this secret, I will not take it up upon any common report, though I well know what that says; but I will tell you how I know it. Somewhat about four hundred years after Innocentius made his comment upon the two great lights, the sun and the moon, the pope and the emperor, a Spanish friar[54] follows the same resemblance between the monarchies of Rome and Spain, in a tract of his, entitled "The Agreement of the two Catholic Monarchies," and printed in Spanish, in Madrid, anno 1612. In the frontispiece or title-page of this book, there are set out two escutcheons: the one, bearing the cross keys of Rome; the other, the arms of

[53] The Emperor Matthias, who stopped the persecution of Protestants, died 1619; and was succeeded by Ferdinand II., a bitter persecutor. Both were cousins to Philip III. of Spain.

[54] John de Puente, [Tomo primero de] *la conveniencia de las dos Monarquias Catolicas, la de la Iglesia Romana, y la del Imperio Español, y defensa de la precedencia de los Reyes Catolicos de España a todos los Reyes del Mundo.* [Autor el Maestro fr. Juan de la Puente, de la orden de Predicadores, Chron sta de la Mag^d Catolica, Calificador de la Inquisicion y Prior de Sta. Tomas de Madrid. 1612. With reference to this work, Thorold (T. C.) *Laud's Labyrinth*, p. 227, observes: "We deny not but such a book was both licensed and printed: but doubtless, whoever peruses the contents of it impartially, will judge it was both licensed and printed rather for its witty conceit, and divertisement for the king and his courtiers, than for a solid foundation, whereon to build any serious and dogmatical assertion." The work itself bears no evidence of other than a serious purpose, in its author.]

Castile and Leon; both joined together with this motto: *In vinculo pacis*, "In the bond of peace." On the one side of this, there is a portraiture resembling Rome, with the sun shining over it and darting his beams on St. Peter's keys, with this inscription: *Luminare majus*,[55] "the greater light," that it may govern the city —that is, Rome—and the whole world; and on the other side there is another image designing Spain, with the moon shining over that, and spreading forth its rays upon the Spanish escutcheon, with this impress: *Luminare minus*,[56] "the less light," that it may be subject to the city,—of Rome, he means,—and so be lord to govern the whole world besides. And over all this, in the top of the title-page, there is printed in capital letters, *Fecit Deus duo luminaria magna*, "God made two great lights." There follows after, in this author, a discovery at large[57] of this blazoning of these arms; but this is the substance of it, and abundantly enough to show what is aimed at—by whom—and for whom. And this book was not stolen out without the will and consent of the state, for it hath printed before it all manner of licence that a book can well have: for it hath the approbation of Father Pedro de Buyza, of the company of the Jesuits; of John de Arcediano, provincial of the Dominicans; of Diego Granero, the licenser appointed for the supreme Council of the Inquisition. And some of these revised this book, by order from the lords of that Council.[58] And last of all, the king's privilege[59] is to it, with high commendation of the work. But the Spaniards had need look to it, for all this, lest the French deceive them. For now lately Friar Campanella hath set out an eclogue upon the birth of the Dauphin, and that *permissu superiorum*, "by licence from his superiors," in which he says expressly: "That all the[1] princes are now more afraid of France than ever, for that there is provided for it *regnum universale*, 'the universal kingdom, or monarchy.'"[60]

[1] [the . . . *earent* Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

[55] Luminare majus, ut præsit urbi et orbi. [*orbis* in the original, corrected by Laud. The greater light, that he may preside over the City and over the World.]

[56] Luminare minus, ut subdatur urbi, et dominetur orbi. [The lesser light that he may be subject to the City (*i.e.* Rome) and be Lord over the World.]

[57] [Declaracion del blason que està en la cabeça deste libro.—This occupies five pages.]

[58] Por orden de los Seniores del Consejo Supremo, [è visto este primero tomo, etc.]

[59] Por mandado del Rey nuestro Señor. [In both cases the words seem to mean that the works were examined and the licence signed by order of the respective authorities, and to be merely the ordinary forms of licensing.]

[60] Quum Gallia alat 20,000,000 hominum, ex singulis centenis sumendo unum, colligit 200,000 strenuorum

[CHAPTER IX.]

A. C. p. 60.

XIII. But it is time to return. For A. C. in this passage hath been very careful to tell us of a parliament, and of living magistrates and judges, besides the law-books. Thirdly, therefore, The Church of England, God be thanked, thrives happily under a gracious prince, and well understands that a parliament[61] cannot be called at all times; and that there are visible judges besides the law-books, and one supreme (long may he be, and be happy!) to settle all temporal differences; which, certainly, he might much better perform, if his kingdoms were well rid of A. C. and his fellows. And she believes too, that our Saviour Christ hath left in His Church, besides His law-book the Scripture, visible magistrates and judges—that is, archbishops and bishops, under a gracious king,[62] to govern both for truth and peace according to the Scripture; and her own canons and constitutions, as also those of the Catholic Church, which cross not the Scripture and the just laws of the realm.[63] But she doth not believe there is any necessity to have one pope or bishop over the whole Christian world, more than to have one emperor over the whole world—which, were it possible, she cannot think fit. Nor are any of these intermediate judges, or that one which you would have supreme, infallible.

A. C. p. 60.

XIV. But since a "kingdom" and a "parliament" please A. C. so well to pattern the Church by, I will follow him in the

militum stipendiatorum, commode, perpetuoque. Propterea omnes terræ principes metuunt nunc magis a Gallia, quam unquam [aut] ab aliis; paratur enim illi *regnum universale.* [Since France feeds 20,000,000 of men, by taking one out of each hundred, he collects easily and continuously round him 200,000 strong paid soldiers. Therefore all the princes of the earth are now more afraid of France than of any other nation; for an universal kingdom is being prepared for her.]—*Ecloga* [*Christianissimis Regi et reginæ*] *in* [*portentosam*] *Delphini* [*orbis Christiani summæ spei*] *nativitatem.* F. Thomæ Campanellæ [ord. Præd. sæculorum excubitoris cantus.] cum annot. Discip. Parisiis, 1639. [p. 4. annot.] Cum permissu superiorum. [Laud's anxiety at the foreign power of France shows his clear head and his foresight. Spain was the traditional enemy of England even in Cromwell's days; but the Spanish power was dwindling fast. Cardinal Richelieu, the French Minister, knew this anxiety of the English statesman and was at this time stirring up the Scottish troubles.]

[61] [In 1639 no Parliament had met in England for ten years.]

[62] [The king is treated by Laud as the chief spiritual person in the realm.]

[63] Non est necesse, ut sub Christo sit unus rector totius ecclesiæ, sed sufficit quod sint plures diversas regentes provincias, quemadmodum sunt plures reges gubernantes plura regna. [It is not necessary that there should be one ruler of the whole Church under Christ; but it is enough that there should be several ruling different provinces, as there are several kings governing several kingdoms.]—Ockam. *Dial.* lib. ii. tract. i. par. 3. cap. 30. ad. 1. [apud Goldast. *S. Rom. Imper. Monarch.* tom. ii. p. 818. ed. Francof. 1614.]

way he goes, and be bold to put him in mind, that in some kingdoms there are divers businesses of greatest consequence, which cannot be finally and bindingly ordered, but in and by parliament; and particularly the statute laws, which must bind all the subjects, cannot be made and ratified but there.[64] Therefore, according to A. C.'s own argument, there will be some businesses also found, (Is not the settling of the divisions of Christendom one of them?) which can never be well settled, but in a General Council;[65] and particularly the making of canons, which must bind all particular Christians and Churches, cannot be concluded and established but there. And again, as the supreme magistrate in the state civil may not abrogate the laws made in parliament, though he may dispense[66] with the sanction or penalty of the law, *quoad hic et nunc*, as the lawyers speak, so in the ecclesiastical body, no bishop, no, not the pope, where his supremacy is admitted, hath power to disannul[67] or violate the true and fundamental decrees of a General Council, though he may perhaps dispense in some cases with some decrees. By all which it appears, though somewhat may be done by the bishops and governors of the Church, to preserve the unity and certainty of faith, and to keep the Church from renting, or for uniting it when it is rent; yet that, in the ordinary way which the Church hath

[64] [This passage shows incidentally how far an absolute monarchy, in our sense, was from Laud's mind. When Laud speaks of an absolute king, he means a king without an earthly superior.]

[65] Propter defectum conciliorum generalium totius Ecclesiæ, quæ sola audet intrepide corrigere omnes, ea mala quæ universalem tangunt Ecclesiam manentia diu incorrecta crescunt. [On account of the want of General Councils of the whole Church, which alone dares boldly to bring men into order, those evils which touch the universal Church, remain this long time uncorrected and therefore increasing.] —Gerson. *declarat. Defectuum Virorum Ecclesiasticorum*, [*Op.*,] tom. i. p. 209. [ed. Paris. 1606. tom. ii. col. 318. C. ed. Dupin. 1706.]

[66] [The necessity of a dispensing power in the Executive is a constant theme of Royalist supporters under the earlier and the later Stuarts.]

[67] Sunt enim indissolubilia decreta, quibus reverentia debita est. [For the decrees cannot be annulled, and reverence must be paid to them.]—S. Prosper. [Aquitan. lib.] *contra Collatorem*, [*i.e.* pro def. S. Augustin. *contra Cassianum*,] cap. i. [*Op.*, col. 310. B. Migne, 217. The quotation gives the sense, not the words, of St. Prosper.] And Turrecremata, who says everything that may be said for the pope's supremacy, yet dares not say, papam posse revocare et tollere omnia statuta generalium conciliorum, sed *aliqua* tantum. [That the Pope can revoke and annul all statutes of general councils, but some only.]—Joann. de Turrecremata, *Summæ de Ecclesia*, lib. iii. cap. 55. [ed. Lugd. 1496.]—Et postea, Papa non potest revocare decreta primorum quatuor conciliorum, quia non sunt nisi declarativa articulorum fidei. [And afterwards, the Pope cannot revoke the decrees of the first four General Councils, because they simply declare the articles of faith.]—*Ibid.* cap. 57. [Respons.] ad secundum.

[CHAPTER IX.] hitherto kept, some things there are, and upon great emergent occasions may be, which can have no other help than a lawful, free, and well composed General Council. And when that cannot be had, the Church must pray that it may, and expect till it may; or else reform itself *per partes*, by national or provincial synods, as hath been said before.[68] And in the mean time, it little beseems A. C., or any Christian, to check at the wisdom of Christ,[69] if He have not taken the way they think fittest to settle Church differences; or if, for the Church's sin or trial, the way of composing them be left more uncertain than they would have it, "that they
1 Cor. xi. 19. which are approved may be known." But the Jesuit had told me before, that a General Council had adjudged these things already. For so he says.

A. C. pp. 59, 60. ℣. I told him, that a General Council, to wit, of Trent, had already judged, not the Roman Church, but the Protestants, to hold errors. "That," said the ℣. "was not a lawful Council."

§ 27. ℟. I. It is true that you replied for the Council of Trent; and my answer was, not only that the Council was not legal in the

[68] Sect. xxiv. No. 1. [*ubi sup.* p. 168.

[69] "And shall we think that Christ, the wisest King, hath not provided," etc.—A. C. p. 60. Where I cannot commend either A. C.'s modesty, that he doth not—or his cunning, that he will not—go so far as some have done before him, though in these words, "shall we think," etc. he goes too far. [Nam] non videretur discretus Dominus fuisse, ut, cum reverentia Ejus loquar, nisi unicum post se talem vicarium reliquisset, qui hæc omnia potest. Fuit autem [iste] vicarius ejus Petrus. (*Matt.* xv.) Et idem dicendum est de successoribus Petri, cum eadem absurditas sequeretur, si post mortem Petri, humanam naturam a se creatam sine regimine unius personæ reliquisset . . . [Et ideo Bonifacius Octavus motus multis aliis efficacibus rationibus, et exemplis, et auctoritatibus sacræ Scripturæ declaravit, dixit, et definivit subesse Romano pontifici omnem humanam creaturam de decessitate salutis, ut in Decretali, *Unam Sanctam*, etc. For the Lord would not appear to have been wise, I speak of Him with all reverence, if He had not left behind Him a sole Viceroy with such powers, one who can do all things. And that Viceroy was Peter. And the same can be said of Peter's successors, for the same absurd consequence would follow, if after Peter's death, God had left the human nature which He had created without the government of one high person. And therefore Boniface VIII. moved by many other sound reasons, examples, and authorities from sacred Scripture, declared, uttered, and defined the Roman Pontiff to have rule over every human creature, and that this was a necessity of salvation, as may be seen in the Decretal *Unam Sanctam.—Extrav. Comm.* [lib. i.] Tit. viii. de Majoritate et Obedientia, cap. *Unam Sanctam*, etc. in addition. D[om.] Petri Bernardi, ed. Paris. 1585. [in Petr. Bernard. *Tract. de Jurisdict. Eccles. et Sæcul.* quæst. iv. apud *Tractat. Juris Utriusque*, tom. xii. fol. 414. col. 1. ed. Venet. 1584. Extat quoque in *Bibl. Vet. Patrum*, tom. xxvi. p. 134. G.]

necessary conditions to be observed in a General Council, but also that it was no General Council—which again you are content to omit. Consider it well. First, Is that Council legal, the abettors whereof maintain publicly that it is lawful for them to conclude any controversy, and make it be *de fide*, and so in your judgment fundamental, though it have not—I do not say now, the written word of God for warrant, either in express letter or necessary sense and deduction, (as all unerring councils have had, and as all must have that will not err,) but,—not so much as probable testimony from it, nay, quite *extra*, "without" the Scripture?[70] Nay, secondly, Is that Council legal[71] where the pope,

[70] Etiamsi nullo Scripturarum, [aut evidenti, aut] probabili testimonio confirmetur, [solidum tamen et indubitatum cuivis fideli et vero Ecclesiæ filio esse debet. Although it were supported by no plain or probable evidence of Scripture, still it ought to be sure and incontestible to every faithful and sincere son of the Church.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv. iv. de potestate Ecclesiæ in se,] Q[uæst.] 1. Ar[tic.] 3. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 744. A. *ubi sup.* p. 33. note 6.]

[71] Here A. C. tells us, "that doubtless the Arians also did mislike that, at Nice, the pope had legates to carry his messages, and that one of them in his place sat as president." Why, but first, it is manifest that Hosius was president at the Council of Nice, and not the Bishop of Rome, either by himself or his legates. And so much Athanasius himself (who was present, and surely understood the Council of Nice, and who presided there, as well as A. C.) tells us: Hosius hic est princeps synodorum. [This Hosius is the chief of the synods.] (So, belike, he presided in other councils as well as at Nice.) Hic formulam fidei in Nicæna synodo concepit. [He arranged the Formula of Faith at the Council of Nice.] (And this the Arians themselves confess to Constantius the emperor, then seduced to be theirs.)—Apud S. Athanas. *Epist. ad solitar. vitam agentes.* [*οὗτος καὶ συνόδων καθηγεῖται, καὶ γράφων ἀκούεται πανταχοῦ· οὗτος καὶ τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν ἐξέθετο, καὶ τοὺς Ἀρειανοὺς ἐκήρυξεν αἱρετικοὺς εἶναι πανταχοῦ·* He also guides Councils and by his writings makes himself heard everywhere; he also arranged the Creed at Nicaea, and everywhere proclaimed the Arians heretics.—S. Athanas. *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos*, cap. xlii. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 369. B. Migne, i. 744.] But then, secondly, I do not except against the pope's sitting as president, either at Nice or Trent; for that he might do when called or chosen to it, as well as any other patriarch, if you consider no more but his sitting as president. But at Nice the cause was not his own, but Christ's against the Arian; whereas, at Trent, it was merely his own—his own supremacy, and his Church's corruptions, against the Protestants; and, therefore, surely not to sit president at the trial of his own cause, though in other causes he might sit, as well as other patriarchs. And for that of Bellarmine, *de Conciliis* [*et Ecclesia*,] lib. i. cap. 21. § [6.] viz. "That it is unjust to deny the Roman prelate his right (jus suum) in calling General Councils, and presiding in them; in possession of which right he hath been for 1500 years." That is but a bold assertion of the cardinal's, by his leave; for he gives us no proof of it, but his bare word. Whereas the very authentic copies of the Councils, published and printed by the Romanists themselves, affirm clearly they were called by emperors, not by the pope; and that the pope did not preside in all of them. And I hope Bellarmine will not expect we should take his bare word against the Councils. And most certain it is, that, even as Hosius presided the Council [an. 325.] at Nice, and no way that as the pope's legate; so also in the second [an. 381.] General Council, which was the first

[CHAPTER IX.]

the chief person to be reformed, shall sit president in it, and be chief judge in his own cause, against all law, divine, natural, and human? In a place not free, but in, or too near, his own dominion? To which all were not called that had deliberative or consultative voice? In which none had suffrage but such as were sworn to the pope and the Church of Rome, and professed enemies to all that called for reformation, or a free council? And the pope[72] himself, to show his charity, had declared and pronounced the appellants heretics, before they were condemned by the council? I hope an assembly of enemies are no lawful council; and I think the decrees of such a one are *omni jure nulla*, and carry their nullity with them through all law.

II. Again: Is that Council general, that hath none of the Eastern Churches' consent, nor presence there? Are all the Greeks so become *non ecclesia*, "no church," that they have no interest in General Councils? It numbers, indeed, among the subscribers six Greeks. They might be so by nation, or by title, purposely given them; but dare you say they were actually bishops of, and sent from, the Greek Church to the Council? Or is it to be accounted a General Council, that in many sessions had scarce ten archbishops, or forty or fifty bishops, present? And for the West of Christendom, nearer home, it reckons one English, St. Asaph.[73] But Cardinal Poole was there too; and English

of Constantinople, Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, presided.—*Concil. Chalced.* Act. vi. p. 136. apud Binium. [*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 953. B.]—In the third, [an. 431.] which was the first at Ephesus, St. Cyril of Alexandria presided; and though Pope Cælestine was joined with him, yet he sent none out of the West to that council till many things were therein finished; as appears apud *Act. Concil.* tom. ii. capp. 16, 17. [*Concil.* tom. iii. col. 609, *et seqq.*]—In the fourth, [an. 451.] at Chalcedon, the legates of the bishop of Rome had the prime place.—[*Concil.* tom. iv. col. 786.]—In the fifth, [Constantinop. II. an. 553.] Eutychius, bishop of Constantinople, was president.—[*Concil.* tom. v. col. 416.]—In the sixth, [Constantinop. III. an. 681.] and seventh, [Nicæn. II. an. 787.] the legates of the pope were president; yet so as that almost all the duty of a moderator or president was performed in the seventh by Tharasius, bishop of Constantinople, as appears manifestly in the Acts of that Council.—[*Concil.* tom. vi. col. 587. and *Concil.* tom. vii. col. 1. and col. 161. etc.]—And since these seven are all the General Councils which the Greeks and Latins jointly acknowledge, and that in these other patriarchs and bishops presided, as oft at least as the bishop of Rome, what is become of Bellarmine's brag, "that the pope hath been possessed of this right of presiding in General Councils for the space of 1500 years?"

[72] Leo. X. Bull. Jun. 8, 1520. —[In Bull. *Exurge Domine*, etc. dat. xvii. Kalend. Julii, an. 1520. apud *Bullarium* tom. i. p. 610. ed. Luxemburg. 1727.]

[73] [Thomas Goldwell went into banishment with Cardinal Reginald Pole; and returned with him to England under Mary. He became Bishop of St. Asaph in 1556; and was

indeed he was by birth, but not sent to that Council by the king and Church of England, but as one of the pope's legates;[74] and so we find him in the fifth session of that Council, but neither before nor after. And at the beginning of the Council he was not bishop in the Church of England; and after he was Archbishop of Canterbury, he never went over to the Council. And can you prove that St. Asaph went thither by authority? There were but few of other nations, and, it may be, some of them reckoned with no more truth than the Greeks. In all the sessions under Paul the Third, but two Frenchmen, and sometimes none—as in the sixth under Julius the Third, when Henry the Second of France protested against that Council; and in the end it is well known how all the French, which were then a good part, held off till the Cardinal of Lorraine was got to Rome. As for the Spaniards, they laboured for many things upon good grounds, and were most unworthily overborne. Section XXVII.

III. To all this A. C. hath nothing to say, but "that it is not necessary to the lawfulness and generalness of a Council that all bishops of the world should be actually present, subscribe, or consent; but that such promulgation be made as is morally sufficient to give notice that such a Council is called, and that all may come, if they will; and that a major part at least of those that are present give assent to the decrees." I will forget that it was but p. 59 in which A. C. speaks of "all pastors," and those not only summoned, but "gathered together." And I will easily grant him, that it is not necessary that all bishops in the Christian world be present and subscribe; but, sure it is necessary to the "generalness" of a Council that some be there, and authorized for all particular Churches;[75] and to the "freedom" of a Council, A. C. p. 62. A. C. p. 59.

present in 1562 at the Council of Trent, having fled from England, and been replaced in the See of St. Asaph by Richard Davyes, consecrated in Jan. 1560.]

[74] Concil. Trid. Sess. 5. [*carent*, Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

[75] Quarta, ut saltem [ex majori parte Christianarum provinciarum aliqui adveniant, et si quidem concilium fit in Oriente, semper visum est sufficere, si ex provinciis omnibus Orientis episcopi conveniant multi; ex toto autem Occidente] mittantur aliqui [a summo pontifice, qui suppleant aliorum locum.] Et [e contrario si celebretur in Occidente] conveniant . . . [multi, ex Oriente autem pauci] aliqui veniant, [nomine aliorum,] etc. [The fourth condition is that at least from the greater number of the Christian provinces some (representatives) should be present; and if the Council was held in the East it was always held to be enough that when many bishops should come from all the eastern provinces, out of the whole West should be sent some by the supreme pontiff, to supply the places of the rest; and if, on the other hand, it was celebrated in the West many ought to come from that side, but from the East a few

[CHAPTER IX.] that all that come may come safe; and to the "lawfulness" of a council, that all may come unengaged, and not fastened to a side, before they sit down to argue or deliberate. Nor is such a "promulgation" as A. C. mentions sufficient, but only in case of contumacy; and that where they which are called, and refuse to come, have no just cause for their not coming, as too many had in the case of Trent. And were such a "promulgation" sufficient for the "generalness" of a council, yet for the "freedom" and the "lawfulness" of it it were not.

[A. C. p. 61.] ℭ. "So," said I, "would [the] Arians say of the Council of Nice." The ℭ. would not admit the case to be like . . .

§ 28. ℭ. So indeed you said; and not you alone. It is the common objection made against all that admit not every latter council as fully as that Council of Nice, famous through all the Christian world. In the mean time, nor you nor they consider that the case is not alike, as I then told you. If the case be alike in all, why do not you admit that which was held at Ariminum,[76] and the second of Ephesus,[77] as well as Nice? If you say, as yours do, it was because the pope approved them not, that is a true cause, but not adequate, or full. For it was because the whole Church refused them; with whom the Roman prelate, standing then entire in the faith, agreed, and so, for his patriarchate, refused those councils.[78] But suppose it is true that these synods were not admitted because the pope refused them, yet this ground is gained, That the case is not alike for men's assent to all councils. And if you look to have this granted, That the pope must confirm, or the council is not lawful, we have far more reason to look that this be not denied, That Scripture must not be departed from in letter or necessary sense, or the council is not lawful.[79] For the consent and confirmation of

should come in the name of the rest.] —Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*et Ecclesia,*] lib. i. cap. 17. § [5. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 35. A.]

[76] [Held in 359, and inclined to Arianism.]

[77] [Held in 449, and supported Eutyches. Pope Leo was its strongest opponent.]

[78] Sect. xxvi. No. 1 [*ubi sup.* p. 221.]

[79] Here A. C. tells us, that the Arians thought so of the Council of Nice, p. 61.; namely, that they departed from letter and sense of Scripture. They said so, indeed. But the testimony of the whole Church, both then and since, went with the Council against the Arian. So is it not here against the Protestant for Trent; for they offer to be tried by that very Council of Nice, and all the ancient councils and fathers of the Church within the first four hundred years, and somewhat farther.

Scripture is of far greater authority to make the council authentical, and the decisions of it *de fide*, than any confirmation of the pope can be. Now of these two, the Council of Nice, we are sure, had the first, the rule of Scripture; and you say it had the second, the pope's confirmation. The Council of Trent, we are able to prove, had not the first, and so we have no reason to respect the second. And to what end do your learned men maintain that a council may make a conclusion *de fide*, though it be simply *extra*,[80] "out of all bound" of Scripture, but out of a jealousy at least, that this of Trent, and some others, have in their determinations left both letter and sense of Scripture? Show this against the Council of Nice, and I will grant so much of the case to be like. But what will you say, if Constantine[81] required "that things thus brought into question should be answered and solved by testimony out of Scripture?" And the bishops of the Nicene Council never refused that rule. And what will you say, if they profess they depart not from it, "but are ready by many testimonies of divine Scripture to demonstrate their faith?"[82] Is the case then alike betwixt it and Trent? Surely no. But you say that I pretended something else, for my not admitting the case to be alike.

SECTION XXVIII.

℣. . . . . pretending that the pope made bishops of purpose, for his side. But this the ℣. proved not. [A. C. p. 62.]

℟. I. No: nor had I reason to take on me to prove what I said not. I know it will be expected I should prove what I say. § 29.

[80] So Stapleton often [*ubi sup.* p. 33. note 6;] but the fathers quite otherwise. Non quæ extra Evangelium sunt, defendam. [I will defend nothing which is not in the gospel.]—S. Hilar. [Pictav.] *ad Constantium*, lib. ii. [cap. 11. *Op.*, col. 1230. E. Migne, ii. 570.]

[81] Literarum divinitus inspiratarum testimoniis. [By the evidence of divinely-inspired writings.]—lib. ii. in *Syn. Nic.* tom. i. per Nicolinum. [ed. Venet. 1585. εὐαγγελικαὶ γὰρ βίβλοι, καὶ ἀποστολικαὶ, καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν τὰ θεσπίσματα σαφῶς ἡμᾶς ἅπερ χρὴ περὶ τοῦ θείου φρονεῖν ἐκπαιδεύουσι· τὴν πολεμοποιὸν οὖν ἀπελάσαντες ἔριν, ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων λάβωμεν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν. [For the books of the gospels and of the apostles and the oracles of the ancient prophets clearly teach us what our opinions on religion shall be: therefore driving away strife which causes war, let us accept the answers to the questions out of the inspired writings.] —Orat. Constant. in *Gelasii Histor. Concil. Nicæni*, apud *Concil.* tom. ii. col. 166. D.]

[82] Ib. in *Osii sententia*, p. 517. Parati ex Sancti Spiritus arbitrio per plurima divinarum Scripturarum testimonia demonstrare hæc ita se habere. [ἑτοίμως ἐχόντων ἡμῶν, σὺν εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, διὰ πλείστων δεῖξαι, ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν. We were ready, with the approval of the Holy Spirit, to prove with a great mass of evidence taken from the Holy Scriptures that these things were so.—in *Gelasii Histor. Concil. Nicæni*, apud *Concil.* tom. ii. col. 174. D.]

[CHAPTER IX.]

And it is hard to prove the purpose of the pope's heart. For if it be proved that he made bishops at that time; that some of them were titular only, and had no livelihood to subsist, but out of his purse, and so must hang their judgment at the strings of it; that some of these thus made were sent to the Council—and sure not without their errand;—yet if the pope will say he neither made nor sent them to overrule the Holy Ghost at that meeting, or of purpose for his side, (as no question but it will be said,) who can prove it, that is not a surveyor of the heart? But though the pope's heart cannot be seen, yet if these and the like presumptions be true, it is a great sign that Trent was too corrupt and factious a meeting for the Holy Ghost to be at.[83] And sure the case in this not alike at Nice.

II. That which I said was, "that Trent could be no indifferent Council to the Church, the pope having made himself a strong party in it." And this I proved, though you be here not only content to omit, but plainly to deny the proof. For I proved it thus, (and you answered not,)[84] "That there were more Italian bishops there than of all Christendom besides." More? Yea,

[83] [See Note B at end of chapter, Bishop Jewel on the Council of Trent.]

[84] Here A. C. is angry, and says, "This was no proof, nor worthy of any answer, or looking into the book for it." First, because it is only "a surmise of adversaries, who are apt to interpret to the worst." Secondly, because "there might be more Italian bishops there, as being nearer, yet without any factious combination with the pope; as in the Greek Councils more Grecians were present."—A. C. p. 62. "No proof," or a "weak" one! Let the reader judge that. But why "no proof?" Because "a surmise of adversaries." Is that a surmise of adversaries that is taken out of the Council itself? Is that Council then become *regnum divisum*, and apt to interpret the worst of itself? Yea, "but there were more Italian bishops, as being nearer." Most true: nearer a great deal than the "Grecian" bishops; but the bishops of France and of some parts of Germany were almost as near as the Italians themselves; and why, then, came no more of these, that were near enough? Well; A. C. may say what he will, but the pope remembered well the Councils of Constance and Basel, and thought it wisdom to make sure work at Trent. For in later times (for their own fears, no doubt), the bishops of Rome have been no great friends to General Councils, especially free ones. Multi suspicantur, quod hæc dissimulaverit Romana curia, et [super his] concilia fieri neglexerit, ut possit ad suæ voluntatis libitum plenius dominari, et jura aliarum ecclesiarum liberius usurpare. Quod non assero esse verum; sed quia [contra eam] hujusmodi laborat infamia, ideo, etc. [Many suspected that the Roman Curia had made this excuse, and had neglected the holding of Councils, in order that it might be able to rule more completely after its own will and to usurp more easily the rights of other Churches. Which I do not assert to be true, but because ill reports of this kind work hard against it (*i.e.* the Roman Church), therefore, etc.]—Pet de Alliaco, Card. Cameracensis lib. [tractat.] *de Reformat. Eccles.* [*oblat. in Concil. Constant.*] *apud Fascic. rerum expetendarum* [*ac fugiendarum.*] fol. cciv. B. [et, apud Joann. Gerson. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 903, etc. ed. Dupin.]

more than double. And this I proved out of the Council itself, which you had in your hand, in *decimo sexto*, but had no great heart to look it. For, where the number of prelates is expressed, that had suffrage and vote in that Council, the Italians are set down to be one hundred and eighty-seven, and all the rest make but eighty-three; so that there were more Italian bishops, by one hundred and four, than of all the rest of Christendom. Sure the pope did not mean to be overreached in this Council. And whatsoever became of his infallibility otherwise, he might this way be sure to be infallible in whatsoever he would have determined; and this, without all doubt, is all the infallibility he hath. So I proved this sufficiently, I think. For if it were not to be sure of a side, give any satisfying reason why such a potent party of Italians, more than double to the whole Christian world, should be there? Show me the like for Nice, and I will give it that the case is alike between these two Councils.

III. Here Bellarmine comes in to help. But sure it will not help you, that he hath offered at as much against the Council of Nice, as I have urged against that at Trent. For he tells us, "that in the Council at Nice there were as few bishops of the West present as were of the East at Trent,"[85] but five in all. Be it so: yet this will not make the case alike between the two Councils. First, because I press not the disparity in number only, but with it the pope's carriage, to be sure of a major part; for it lay upon the pope to make sure work at Trent, both for himself and his Church. But neither the Greek Church in general, nor any patriarch of the East, had any private interest to look to in the Council at Nice. Secondly, because I press not so much against the Council of Trent, that there were so exceeding many bishops of the West compared with those of the East—for that must needs be, when a Council is held in the West—but, that there were so many more Italians, and bishops obnoxious to the pope's power, than of all Germany, France, Spain, and all other parts of the West besides. Thirdly, because both Bellarmine and A. C. seek to avoid the dint of this argument, by comparing the Western with the Eastern bishops, and are content to say nothing about the excessive number of Italians to others of

[85] [Sic] in Concilio Niceno I. ex occidente solum fuerunt duo presbyteri missi ex Italia, unus episcopus ex Gallia, unus ex Hispania, et unus ex Africa. [So in the first Council of Nice, the West was represented only by two priests sent from Italy, one bishop from France, one from Spain, and one from Africa.]—Bellarmin. lib. i. *de Concil.* cap. 17. § antepenult.

[CHAPTER IX.]

the West, that will receive a fuller answer than any of the rest. For though very few Western bishops were at the Council of Nice, being so remote, yet at[a] the same time Pope Sylvester held a Council at Rome, in which he, with two hundred and seventy-five bishops of the West, "confirmed the Nicene Creed, and anathematized all those which should dare to dissolve the definition of that holy and great Council."[86] Now, let Bellarmine, or A. C., or any else, show, that when the Council of Trent sat, there was another Council,—though never so privately, in regard of their miserable oppression—which sat in Greece, or anywhere in the East, under any patriarch or Christian bishop, which did confirm the canons of the Council of Trent, and anathematize them which admitted them not; and I will confess they speak home to the comparison between the Councils, else a blind man may see the difference, and it is a vast one.

[a] [at . . . *carré* Edit. 1686.]

A. C. p. 62.

IV. But here A. C. makes account he hath found a better reply to this; and now tells us, that "neither French, nor Spanish, nor schismatical Greeks, did agree with Protestants in those points which were defined in that council, especially after it was confirmed by the pope, as appears by the censure of Jeremias, the Greek patriarch." Who agreed with the Protestants in the points defined by that Council, as he speaks—or rather, to speak properly, against the points there defined—I know not. And for aught A. C. knows, many might agree with them in heart, that in such a Council durst not open themselves. And what knows A. C. how many might have been of their opinion in the main, before the Council ended, had they been admitted to a fair and a free dispute? And it may be too, some decrees would have been more favourable to them, had not the care of the pope's interest made them sourer. For else what mean these words, "especially after it was confirmed by the pope?" As for Jeremias, it is true, his censure is in many things against the Protestants; but I find not that that censure of his is warranted by any authority of the Greek Church, or that he gave the Protestants any hearing before he passed his censure. And, at the most, it is but the censure of

[86] Omnes qui ausi fuerint dissolvere definitionem sancti et magni concilii, quod apud Nicæam congregatum est, [sub præsentia piissimi et venerandi principis Constantini Augusti,] anathematizamus. [Let all be anathema who shall dare to injure the definition of the great and holy Council which assembled at Nicæa, under the protection of that most pious and most venerable Prince, Constantine Augustus.]—Concil. Roman. III. sub Sylvestro, apud Binium, p. 449.

a schismatic, in A. C.'s own judgment. And for his flourish which follows, "that East and West would condemn Protestants for heretics," I would he would forbear prophesying, till both parts might meet in a free General Council that sought Christ more than themselves. But I find the Jesuit hath not done with me yet, but adds: SECTION XXIX

> F. In fine, the B. wished, that a lawful General Council were called, to end controversies. The persons present said, that the king was inclined thereunto, and that therefore we Catholics might do well to concur. [A. C. pp. 62, 63.]

B. And what say you to my wish? You pretend great love to the truth: would you not have it found? Can you or any Christian be offended, that there should be a good end of controversies? Can you think of a better end than by a General Council? And if you have a most gracious king inclined unto it, as you say it was offered, how can you acquit yourselves if you do not consent? Now here A. C. "marvels what kind of General Council I would have, and what rules I would have observed in it, which are morally like to be observed, and make an end of controversies, better than their Catholic General Councils." Truly, I am not willing to leave A. C. unsatisfied in any thing; nor have I any meaning to trouble the Church with any new devisings of mine. Any General Council shall satisfy me—and, I presume, all good Christians—that is lawfully called, continued, and ended, according to the same course, and under the same conditions,[87] which General Councils observed in the primitive Church; which, I am sure, were Councils General and Catholic, whatever yours be. But I doubt, that after all noise made about these requisite conditions, A. C. and his fellows will be found as much, if not more defective in performance of the conditions, than in the conditions themselves. § 30. A. C. p. 62.

[87] Ex iis conciliis quæ omnium consensu generalia fuerunt, qualia sunt quatuor prima: ex consuetudine autem Ecclesiæ colligimus quatuor conditiones [et] sufficere et requiri, [ad generale Concilium. Judging by those Councils which all accept as General Councils, such as the first four; and from the customs of the Church we gather that four conditions are sufficient and are required for a General Council.]—Bellarmin. *de Concil.* lib. i. cap. xvii. § 2.

[CHAPTER IX.]

[*NOTE A.*

LAUD'S ANSWER TO LORD SAY'S SPEECH TOUCHING THE LITURGY.

The following quotation will show Laud's position towards the secular power. The King, he considered, had a spiritual commission from God.

I will not dispute it here, what power a lay assembly (and such a Parliament is) hath to determine matters of religion, primely and originally by and of themselves, before the Church hath first agreed upon them. Then, indeed, they may confirm or refuse. And this course was held in the Reformation. But originally to take this power over religion into lay hands, is that which hath not been thus assumed, since Christ to these unhappy days: and I pray God this chair of religion do not prove cathedra pestilentiæ, as the Vulgar reads it in Ps. i. 1, to the infecting of this whole nation with schism and heresy, and in the end bring all to confusion.

I meddle not here with the King's power. For he may be present in Convocation when he pleases, and take or leave any canons he pleases, which are for the peace and well ordering of the Church; as well as in Parliament, take or leave any laws made ready for him, for the good and quiet of his people. But if it come to be matter of faith, though in his absolute power he may do what he will, and answer God for it after; yet he cannot commit the ordering of that to any lay assembly, Parliament, or other, for them to determine that which God hath intrusted into the hands of His priests. Though, if he will do this the clergy must do their duty to inform him and help that dangerous error if they can: but if they cannot, they must suffer an unjust violence how far soever it proceed; but they may not break the duty of their allegiance.

'Tis true Constantius the emperor, a great patron of the Arians, was by them interested in their cause, and meddled in decernendo, in determining, and that beforehand, what the prelates should do; and sometimes in commanding the orthodox prelates to communicate with the Arians. This they refused to do, as being against the Canons of the Council of Nice.

And then his answer was, "Yea, but that which I will shall go for a Canon." But then we must know withal, that Athanasius reckoned him for this, as that Antichrist which Daniel prophesied of. Hosius also, the famous confessor of those times, condemned in him that kind of meddling in and with religion. And so doth St. Hilary of Poictiers. Valentinian also, the younger, took upon him to judge of religion at the like persuasion of Auxentius the

Arian, but he likewise was sharply reproved for it by St. Ambrose. In like manner, Maximus the tyrant took upon him to judge in matters of religion, as in the case of Priscillian and his associates. But this also was checked by St. Martin, Bishop of Tours: where it is again to be observed, that though these emperors were too busy in venturing upon the determination of points of faith, yet no one of them went so far as to take the power from the synods, and give it to the senate. And the orthodox and understanding emperors did neither the one nor the other. For Valentinian the elder left this great Church-work to be done by Churchmen. And though the power to call Councils was in the emperor, and though the emperors were sometimes personally present in the Councils, and sometimes by their deputies, both to see order kept, and to inform themselves, yet the decisive voices were in the clergy only. And this will plainly appear in the instructions given by the Emperor Theodosius to Candidianus, whom he sent to supply his place in the Council of Ephesus; which were, "That he should not meddle with matters of faith, if any came to be debated." And gives this reason for it: "Because it is unlawful for any but bishops to mingle himself with them in those consultations." And Basilius the emperor, long after this, in the eighth General Council, held at Constantinople, 870, affirms it of the laity in general, "that it is no way lawful for them to meddle with these things. But that it is proper for the patriarchs, bishops, and priests, which have the office of government in the Church, to enquire into these things." And more of this argument might easily be added, were that needful, or I among my books, and my thoughts at liberty. And yet this crosses not the supremacy which the King of England hath in causes ecclesiastical: as it is acknowledged both by the Church and law. For that reaches not to the giving of him power to determine points of faith, either in Parliament or out; or to the acknowledgment of any such power residing in him; or to give him power to make Liturgies, and public forms of prayer; or to preach or administer sacraments; or to do anything which is merely spiritual. But in all things which are of a mixed cognisance, such as are all those which are properly called ecclesiastical, and belong to the bishop's external jurisdiction; the supremacy there, and in all things of like nature, is the king's. And if at any time the emperor or his deputy sit judge in a point of faith, it is not because he hath any right to judge it, or that the Church hath not right; but merely in case of contumacy, where the heretic is wilful, and will not submit to the Church's power. And this the heretics sometimes did; and then the bishops were forced to appeal thither also; but not for any resolution in the point of faith, but for aid and assistance to the just power of the Church.—Laud's *Works*, vol. vi., pt. i., p. 142. Oxford, 1849.]

[CHAPTER IX.]

[*NOTE B.*

The following extracts from Jewel (Bishop of Salisbury, 1560) *will show the feeling of contemporary Englishmen about the Council of Trent.*

ACCOUNT OF COUNCIL OF TRENT UNDER JULIUS III.

And yet, for all these fathers had such malicious and stiff-necked enemies, yet if they had come they should have had free speech in the councils. But now sithence none of us may be suffered so much as to sit, or once to be seen in these men's meetings, much less suffered to speak freely our mind; and seeing the pope's legates, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and abbots, all being conspired together, all linked together in one kind of fault, and all bound by one oath, sit alone by themselves, and have power alone to give their consent; and at last when they have all done, as though they had done nothing, bring all their opinions to be judged at the will and pleasure of the pope, being but one man, to the end he may pronounce his own sentence of himself, who ought rather to have answered to his complaint, sithence also the same ancient and Christian liberty, which of all right should specially be in Christian councils, is now utterly taken away from the council—for these causes, I say, wise and good men ought not to marvel at this day, though we do the like now, that they see was done in times past in like case of so many fathers and catholic bishops; which is as though we choose rather to sit at home and leave our whole cause to God than to journey thither; whereas we neither shall have place nor be able to do any good; whereas we can obtain no audience; whereas princes' ambassadors be but used as mocking-stocks; and whereas also all we be condemned already, before trial; as though the matter were aforehand despatched and agreed upon.—*Apology*, p. 56, Parker Society Edition, 1848.

COUNCIL OF TRENT UNDER PIUS IV.

But because he hath already so noted us openly, lest by holding our peace we should seem to grant a fault, and specially because we can by no means have audience in the public assembly of the general council, wherein he would no creature should have power to give his voice, or declare his opinion, except he were sworn and strictly bound to maintain his authority—for we have had good experience hereof in his last conference at the Council of Trident; where the ambassadors and divines of the princes of Germany, and of the free cities, were quite shut out from their company: neither can we yet forget how Julius

the Third, above ten years past provided warily by his writ, that none of our sect should be suffered to speak in the council (except there were some man peradventure that would recant and change his opinion).—*Apology*, p. 96.

SECTION XXX.

JULIUS III.'S BULL.

Whether Pope Julius by his bull utterly embarred the divines and ambassadors of the princes and free cities of Germany from all audience and disputation in the council, or no, I report me to Pope Julius' own bull touching the same. His words be these: Erit concilium, ut qui temere loquuti sunt, aut dicta recantaturi veniant, aut eorum inaudita causa, in executionem jam ordinatarum constitutionum haeretici declarentur et condemnentur: "There shall be a council, that they that have spoken rashly, either may recant their sayings or else without further hearing or reasoning of the matter, they may be denounced and condemned for heretics, according to the constitutions already made."

I could further allege Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Johannes Fabritius Montanus, Petrus Paulus Vergerius, the bishop of Justinopolis, to like purpose: but perhaps Mr. Harding would refuse their authorities, and call them partial; yet in a matter so evident, and so openly known, it had been great folly for them to dissemble. Illyricus saith: Nostri audiri non potuerunt, quamvis id amplissimi Caesaris legati orarent: "Our divines and orators could in nowise be heard, notwithstanding the emperor's most worthy ambassadors had desired it." Johannes Fabritius saith: Fateor extensionem factam esse ad alias nationes; sed tamen additur, eam formam non nisi ad illos pertinere, qui resipiscere et ad ecclesiae gremium redire veluit: "I grant the safe conduct was extended to other nations; but it is added withal, that the same form or liberty should pertain to none others, but only to them that would repent, and return to the bosom of the Church." And again he saith: Tantum aberant ab arce disputationum, ut ne ad vestibulum quidem accedere potuerint: "The divines of the princes of Germany were kept so far off from the high castle of disputation, that they could not be suffered to approach to the entry." Petrus Paulus Vergerius saith, that the bishop of Vegla in Dalmatia was sore shaken up in the same council, and threatened with deprivation and other extremities, only for a little inkling of the truth.—*Apology*, p. 207.]

[CHAPTER X.

The Possibility of Error in a General Council.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

But, says the Jesuit, is a General Council infallible? for if the English hold it may err we are no nearer to unity by trusting such a Council as the final judge. Laud answers, a General Council may err; but it must be obeyed till another General Council reverses its decision. The whole Church cannot err in fundamentals; but a Council is only representative, and thus many of the best and wisest men may be left out; and it cannot be as strong as the body it represents. It is evident that nothing but the assistance of the Holy Ghost can keep a General Council free from error; and the Scriptural promises of this assistance do not go so far as to ensure the complete absence of error. The passages are examined, viz. St. John xvi. 13 and xiv. 16; St. Matthew xxviii. 20 and xvi. 18, on which the patristic explanations of the Rock are quoted and considered; and xviii. 20; St. Luke xxii. 32; and Acts xv. 28. The passage in Acts is the strongest; but it speaks of a Council in which inspired men sat; and this is true of no other.

The Church in general can not err in the faith necessary to salvation. According to St. Augustine, the Scripture alone is infallible (Scriptura præponitur); he affirms that one General Council may amend another. And it is not fair to say that this admission opens the door to every private spirit to interfere; for only a General Council can reverse the decision of that which went before.

The voice of the Church in Council may be called Divine; but not "simply Divine"; only Divine in a manner. A Council is not the equal of Scripture; neither its conclusions nor its means are infallible. The Romanist claim is that, though the means are not infallible, the conclusions are infallible; but no Father supports them.

Next, Laud maintains that the reason has the right to challenge the reasoning and the decisions of Councils. In actual experience, Councils

are often influenced by parties. The Church must retain the power to reconsider and revise decisions; as was done in the case of the Councils of Rimini and Ephesus. The Council of Constance decided contrary to Christ's express command about the Communion. The Church can always hold a new Council to revise previous decisions.] SECTION XXX.

Well the Jesuit goes on for all this:

℣. I asked the ℟. whether he thought a General Council might err? He said, It might. [A. C. p. 63.]

℟. I presume, you do not expect I should enter into the proof of this controversy, Whether a General Council may err in determination, or not? Yourself brought no proof that it cannot; and till that be brought, my speech is good that it can; and yet I hope to be found no infringer of any power given by Christ to His Church. But it seems by that which follows, you did by this question, "Can a General Council err?" but seek to win ground for your other, which follows: § 31.

℣. "If a General Council may err, what nearer are we then," said I, "to unity, after a Council hath determined?" "Yes," said he, "although it may err, yet we should be bound to hold with it till another come to reverse it." [A. C. p. 63.]

℟. I. Whether a General Council may err or not, is a question of great consequence in the Church of Christ. To say it cannot err, leaves the Church not only without remedy against an error once determined, but also without sense that it may need a remedy, and so without care to seek it; which is the misery of the Church of Rome at this day. To say it can err, seems to expose the members of the Church to an uncertainty and wavering in the faith; to make unquiet spirits; not only to disrespect former councils of the Church, but also to slight and contemn whatsoever it may now determine; into which error some opposers of the Church of Rome have fallen. And upon this is grounded your question, "Wherein are we nearer to unity, if a council may err?" But in relating my answer to this, you are not so candid; for my words did not sound as yours seem to do, "That we should hold with the Council, err or not err, till another came to reverse it"; as if grounds of faith might vary at the racket, and be cast of each side as a cunning hand might lay them. § 32.

[CHAPTER X.]

II. You forget again—omit, at least—and with what mind you best know, the caution which I added. For I said, "The determination of a General Council erring was to stand in force, and to have external obedience at the least yielded to it, till evidence of Scripture,[1] or a demonstration to the contrary, made the error appear; and until thereupon another Council[2] of equal authority did reverse it." And, indeed, I might have returned upon you again: If a General Council not confirmed by the Pope may err, (which you affirm,) to what end then a General Council? And you may answer, Yes; for though a General Council may err, yet the pope, as head of the Church, cannot. An excellent means of unity, to have all in the Church as the pope will have it, whatever Scripture say, or the Church think! And then, I pray, to what end a General Council? Will his holiness be so holy, as to confirm a General Council if it determine against him? And as for Bellarmine's[3] reasons why a General Council should be useful, if not necessary, though the pope be infallible, they are so weak in part, and in part so unworthy, that I am sorry any necessity of a bad cause should force so learned a man to make use of them.

[1] Sect. xxxiii. Consid. 5. No. 1, 2. [*vide infra*, pp. 284-287.] And the reason of this is, because to have a General Council deceived, is not impossible: but altogether impossible it is, that demonstrative reason or testimony divine should deceive.—Hooker, *Eccl. Polit.* Book ii. ch. vii. [Sec. 5. *Works*, vol. i. pp. 323, 324, ed. Church & Paget. His words are: "I grant that proof derived from the authority of man's judgment is not able to work that assurance which doth grow by a stronger proof; and therefore although ten thousand General Councils would set down one and the same definitive sentence concerning any point of religion whatsoever, yet one demonstrative reason alleged, or one manifest testimony cited from the mouth of God Himself to the contrary, could not choose but overweigh them all; inasmuch as for them to have been deceived, it is not impossible; it is, that demonstrative reason or testimony divine should deceive."]

[2] In which case, Maldonat[us] puts in the shrewdest argument; namely, That this way we should never have a certain end of controversies; for, to try whether any thing were decreed according to the word of God by one General Council, we should need another Council; and then another to try that; and so *in infinitum*. So our faith should never have where to settle and rest itself.—Maldonat. in *St. Matth.* xviii. 20. But to this I answer, That the ancient Church took this way, as will afterward appear in St. Augustine. Next, here is no uncertainty at all; for no General Council lawfully called, and so proceeding, can be questioned in another, unless it so fall out, that evident Scripture or a demonstration appear against it. But either of these are so clear and manifest, that there need be no fear of proceeding *in infinitum*, and leaving the faith in uncertainty, in necessaries to salvation. And in curious speculations it is no matter, whether there be certainty or no, with or without a council.—[*Vide infra*, Sect. xxxiii. Consid. 5. No. 1, 2. [pp. 284-287.]

[3] Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 7. § 3. *et seqq.*

SECTION XXXII.

III. Here A. C. tells me: "The caution mentioned as omitted, makes my answer worse than the Jesuit related it; and that in two things. First, in that the Jesuit relates it thus: 'although it may err'; but the caution makes it as if it did actually err. Secondly, in that the Jesuit relates 'that we are bound to hold it till another come to reverse it'; that is, we not knowing whether it do err or not, but only that it may err. But the caution puts the case so, as if the determination of a General Council actually erring were not *ipso jure* invalid, but must stand in force, and have external obedience yielded to it, till not only moral certainty, but evidence of Scripture, or a demonstration to the contrary, make the error appear; and when it appears, we must yield our obedience till a council of equal authority reverse it, which perhaps will not be found in a whole age. So either the Jesuit relates this speech [more] truly, or less disgracefully." And A. C. thinks that, upon better judgment, I will not allow this caution. Truly, I shall not thank the Jesuit for any his kindness here. And for the "caution," I must and do acknowledge it mine, even upon "advisement," and that whether it make my answer worse or better. And I think farther, that the Jesuit hath no great cause to thank A. C. for this Defence of his Relation.

A. C. pp. 63, 64.

IV. First, then, the Jesuit, so says A. C., doth in his Relation make it but a supposition, that a General Council may err; but the "caution" expresses it as actually erring. True; but yet I hope this expression makes no General Council actually err. And then it comes all to one, whether I suppose that such a Council may err, or that it do err; and it is fitter for clearing the difficulties into which the Church falls in such a case, to suppose—and more than a supposition it is not—a General Council actually[4] erring, than as only under a possibility of erring. For the Church hath much more to do to vindicate itself from such an error actually being, than from any the like error that might be.

A. C. p. 63.

[[4] Nec particularis illa Romana, sed universalis ecclesia, non quidem] in generali synodo [congregata], quam aliquoties errasse percepimus, [velut illa Ariminiensis . . . sed est ecclesia Christi catholica per totum mundum dispersa. It is not the particular Church of Rome, but the universal Church, not indeed assembled in a General Council, for such a Council we have found often to have made mistakes, as, for instance, that of Rimini . . . no, it is the Catholic Church of Christ dispersed throughout the world.]—[Thom.] Waldensis, *Doctrinal. Fidei*, tom. i. lib. ii. artic. ii. cap. xix. § 1. [fol. xcix. col. 1, 2.]

[CHAPTER X.]

A. C. p. 63.

V. Secondly, A. C. thinks he hath got great advantage by the words of the "caution"; in that I say, "a General Council erring is to stand in force, and have external obedience," at least so far as it consists in silence, patience, and forbearance yielded to it, "till evidence of Scripture, or a demonstration to the contrary, make the error appear, and until thereupon another Council of equal authority did reverse it." Well! I say it again. But is there any one word of mine in the caution, that speaks of our "knowing" of this error? Surely not one; that is A. C.'s addition. Now, suppose a General Council actually erring in some point of Divine truth, I hope it will not follow that this error must be so gross as that forthwith it must needs be known to private men; and, doubtless, till they know it, obedience must be yielded; nay, when they know it, if the error be not manifestly against fundamental verity, (in which case a General Council cannot easily err,) I would have A. C. and all wise men consider, whether "external obedience" be not even then to be yielded; for if controversies arise in the Church some end they must have, or they will tear all in sunder; and I am sure no wisdom can think that fit. Why, then, say a General Council err, and an erring decree be *ipso jure*, by the very law itself, invalid; I would have it wisely considered again, whether it be not fit to allow a General Council that honour and privilege which all other great courts have—namely, that there be a declaration of the invalidity of its decrees, as well as of the laws of other courts, before private men can take liberty to refuse obedience. For, till such a declaration, if the council stand not in force, A. C. sets up private spirits to control General Councils; which is the thing he so often and so much cries out against in the Protestants. Therefore it may seem very fit and necessary for the peace of Christendom that a General Council thus erring should stand in force till "evidence of Scripture," or a "demonstration," make the error to appear, as "that another council of equal authority reverse it."[5] For as for "moral certainty," that is not strong enough in points of faith, which alone are spoken of here. And if another council "of equal authority" cannot be gotten together in an age, that is such an inconvenience as the Church must bear when it happens. And far better is that

[5] It is not long since A. C. compared Councils to Parliaments; it was but p. 60. And I hope a parliament, and the acts of it, must stand in force, though something be mistaken in them, or found hurtful, till another parliament of equal authority reverse it and them. For I presume you will not have any inferior authority to abrogate Acts of Parliament.

inconvenience than this other, That any authority less than a General Council should rescind the decrees of it, unless it err "manifestly and intolerably";[6] or that the whole Church, upon peaceable and just complaint of this error, neglect or refuse to call a council and examine it; and there come in national or provincial councils to reform for themselves.[7] But no way must lie open to private men to refuse obedience[8] till the council be heard and weighed, as well as that which they say against it; yet with Bellarmine's exception still, "so the error be not manifestly intolerable."[9] Nor is it fit for private men, in such great cases as this, upon which the whole peace of Christendom depends, to argue thus: The error appears, Therefore the determination of the council is *ipso jure* invalid; but this is far the safer way—I say still, when the error is neither fundamental nor in itself manifest—to argue thus: The determination is by equal authority, and that *secundum jus*, "according to law," declared to be invalid, Therefore the error appears. And it is a more humble and conscientious way for any private man to suffer a council to go before him, than for him to outrun the council; but weak and ignorant men's outrunning both God and His Church, is as bold a fault now on all sides, as the daring of the times hath made it common. As for that which I have added concerning the possibility of a General Council's erring, I shall go on with it, without asking any farther leave of A. C.

SECTION XXXII.

§ 33. For, upon this occasion, I shall not hold it amiss a little more at large to consider the point of General Councils, How they may, or may not err; and a little to look into the Roman and Protestant opinion concerning them; Which is more agreeable to the power and rule which Christ hath left in His Church; and, Which is most preservative of peace established, or ablest to reduce perfect unity into the Church of Christ, when that poor ship hath her ribs dashed in sunder by the waves of contention. And this I will adventure to the world, but only in the nature of a consideration,

[6] Sect. xxxiii. Consid. 4. No. 1 [*vide infra*, p. 279.]

[7] Sect. xxiv. No. 1. [*ubi sup.* p. 168.]

[8] Sect. xxxviii. No. 15.

[9] Non est inferiorum judicare, an superiores legitime procedant, necne, nisi manifestissime constet intolerabilem errorem committi. [It is not the business of inferiors to decide whether their superiors proceed according to law, by no means, unless there is most evident proof that an intolerable error is committed.]—Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritate,*] lib. ii. cap. viii. § 8.—Nisi manifeste constet, etc.—Jac. Almain in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] unica, *in fine.* [*ubi sup.* p. 167. note 49.]

[CHAPTER X.] and with submission to my mother, the Church of England, and the mother of us all, the Universal Catholic Church of Christ: as I do most humbly all whatsoever else is herein contained.

Consid. I. First, then, I consider, Whether all the power that an Œcumenical Council hath to determine, and all the assistance it hath not to err in that determination, it hath it not all from the catholic universal body of the Church,[10] and clergy in the Church, whose representative[11] it is? And it seems it hath. For the government of the Church being not monarchical,[12] but as Christ is head, this principle is inviolable in nature: Every body collective that represents, receives power and privileges from the body which is represented; else a representation might have force without the thing it represents, which cannot be. So there is no power in the council, no assistance to it, but what is in and to the Church. But yet then it may be questioned, Whether the representing body hath all the power, strength, and privilege which the represented hath?[13] And suppose it hath all the legal power, yet it hath not all the natural, either of strength or wisdom, that the whole hath. Now, because the representative hath power from the whole—and the main body can meet no other way—therefore the acts, laws, and decrees of the representative, be it ecclesiastical or civil, are binding in their strength; but they are not so certain, and free

[10] [Quod] si ecclesiæ universitati non est data ulla auctoritas, ergo neque concilio generali, quatenus ecclesiam universalem repræsentat. [But if no authority is given to the whole body of the Church, then none is given either to a General Council, in so far as it represents the universal Church.] —Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 16. § 4. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 94. C.]

[11] [Dubit. sext. Secunda propositio,] Concilium generale, [eam (scil. ecclesiam Romanam)] representans, [legitime congregatum, non potest errare in fide. A General Council, representing her (*i.e.* the Roman Church) and lawfully assembled, cannot err in a matter of faith.]—Jac. Almain. in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] unica. [fol. lxxii.]—[Secunda restrictio est, ut illud, Ecclesia non potest errare, intelligatur de sola ecclesia universali, non autem extendatur ad] episcopos, qui sunt Ecclesia repræsentative, ut nostri loquuntur: [quilibet enim episcopus gerit personam suæ ecclesiæ particularis, et proinde omnes episcopi gerunt personam totius ecclesiæ. The second restriction is that the statement, the Church cannot err, should be understood of the universal Church alone, but not extended to the bishops, who are the Church representatively, as is often said; for every bishop takes the place of (*i.e.* represents) his own particular church; and further, all the bishops take the place of (represent) the whole Church.]—Bellarmin. *de Ecclesia Militante*, lib. iii. cap. 14. § 3. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 148. C, D.]

[12] Sect. xxvi. No. 8. [*ubi sup.* p. 229.]

[13] Omnis representatio virtute minor est re ipsa, vel veritate, cujus representatio est. [Every representation has less excellence than the actual thing or truth of which it is the representative.]—Colligitur aperte ex S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.* Prim. Secund. Q[uæst.] ci. Art. 2. [Respons.] ad 2. [Migne, ii. 794.]

from error, as is that wisdom which resides in the whole: for in assemblies merely civil, or ecclesiastical, all the able and sufficient men cannot be in the body that represents. And it is as possible so many able and sufficient men,[14] for some particular business, may be left out, as that they which are in may miss or misapply that reason and ground upon which the determination is principally to rest. Here, for want of a clear view of this ground, the representative body errs; whereas the represented, by virtue of those members which saw and knew the ground, may hold the principle inviolated.[15] SECTION XXXIII.

Secondly, I consider, That since it is thus in nature and in civil bodies, if it be not so in ecclesiastical too, some reason must be given why; "for that body also consists of men";[16] those men, neither, all equal in their perfections of knowledge and judgment, whether acquired by industry, or rooted in nature, or infused by God;—not all equal, nor any one of them perfect and absolute, or freed from passion and human infirmities. Nor doth their meeting together make them infallible in all things; though the act which is hammered out by many together, must in reason be perfecter than that which is but the child of one man's sufficiency. If, then, a General Council have no ground of not erring from the men or the meeting, either it must not be at all, or it must be by some assistance and power upon them when they are so met together; and this, if it be less than the assistance of the Holy Ghost, it cannot make them secure against error. Consid. II.

1. Thirdly, I consider, That the assistance of the Holy Ghost is without error. That is no question; and as little there is, That a council hath it. But the doubt that troubles is, Whether all[1] assistance of the Holy Ghost be afforded in such a high manner, as to cause all the definitions of a council in matters fundamental in the faith, and in remote deductions from it, to be alike infallible? Consid. III.

[1] [the assistance . . . Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

[14] Posset contingere quod congregati in Concilio Generali essent pauci et vies, tam in re, quam in hominum reputatione, respectu ilorum, qui ad illud Concilium Generale minime convenissent, etc. [It might happen that the men collected in a General Council should be few and common, both in fact and in public estimation, in comparison with others who had not come to that General Council.]—Ockam. *Dial.* par. 3. lib. iii. cap. 13. [apud Goldast. *Monarch. S. Roman. Imper.* tom. ii. p. 829.]

[15] [Laud in politics using the same arguments often appealed to the people from the House of Commons. In short, he asks for "the Referendum."]

[16] Ecclesia est unum corpus mysticum per similitudinem ad naturale. [The Church is a single mystical body, and may be compared with a natural body.]—Durand. in III. *Sentent.* Distinct. xiv. Quæst. i. No. 5.—[Gabr.] Biel, in *Exposit. Can. Missæ*, etc., lect. xxiii. [fol. xxxi. *v.* col. 2.]

[CHAPTER X.]

Now the Romanists, to prove there is "infallible assistance,"[17] produce some places of Scripture; but no one of them infers, much less enforces, an infallibility. The places which Stapleton there rests upon, are these: "I will send you the Spirit of Truth, which will lead you into all truth." And, "This Spirit shall abide with you for ever." And, "Behold, I am with you to the end of the world." To these, others add, "The founding of the Church upon the rock, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail." And Christ's prayer for St. Peter, "that his faith fail not." And Christ's promise, "that where two or three are gathered in His name, He will be in the midst of them." And that in the Acts, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

John xvi. 13. John xiv. 16. Matt. xxviii. 20. Matt. xvi. 18. Luke xxii. 32. Matt. xviii. 20. Acts xv. 28.

2. For the first, which is, "leading into all truth," and that "for ever"; "all,"[18] is not always universally taken in Scripture. Nor it is here simply for "all truth": for then a General Council could no more err in matter of fact than in matter of faith, in which yet yourselves grant it may err.[19] But "into all truth,"[20] is a limited "all": "into all truth absolutely necessary to salvation"; and this, when they suffer themselves to be led by the Blessed Spirit, by the word of God; and all truth which Christ had before, at least fundamentally, delivered unto them: "He shall receive of Mine, and show it unto you." And again, "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, which I have told you." And for this necessary truth, too, the Apostles received this promise, "not for themselves and a council, but for themselves and the whole Catholic Church,"[21]

John xvi. 14. John xiv. 26.

[17] Omnem veritatem infallibiliter docendi, etc. [Of teaching infallibly every verity.]—Stapleton. *Relect.* [*Controv.*] Præf. ad Lectorem. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 514.]

[18] Prosp. [Aquitan. seu potius, ignoti auctoris,] *de vocat.* [*omn.*] *gentium*, lib. i. cap. 10. [apud S. Prosper. *Op.*, col. 862. B—D. Migne, 662-3.]

[19] Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctorit.*] lib. ii. cap. 8. §[5. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 64. A.] Where he saith, Respondeo, quidam [aiunt,] quæstionem fuisse de facto, non de jure; in ejusmodi [autem] judiciis concilia errare posse, non dubium est. [I answer, some say, it was a question of fact not of law; and in decisions of this kind Councils can err, without a doubt.]

[20] Dubium est, an quod dicit, Docebit omnia *S. Joh.* xiv. 26. referendum sit, (ad illud [verbum,] Quæcunque dixero vobis,) quasi non aliud docturum Spiritum Sanctum dicat, quam quod Ipse antea docuisset. Non repugnabo, si quis ita velit interpretari, etc. [It is doubtful, whether His words, "He will teach you all things," etc., *St. John* xiv. 26, are to be referred to that sentence, "Whatsoever I have told you;" and taken as if He meant that the Holy Spirit would teach nothing more than what He had previously taught. I will not oppose any one who should so interpret it.]—Maldonat. in *S. Johan.* xiv. [26.]

[21] Bellarmin. *de Conc.* [*auctorit.*] lib. ii. cap. 9. §[3.] Assistit [enim concilio] Spiritus Sanctus non [tam] propter [ipsum] concilium, quam [propter] Ecclesiam universam. [For the Holy Spirit assists the Council not so much

of which a council, be it never so general, is a very little part. Yea, and this very assistance is not so absolute, nor in that manner, to the whole Church, as it was to the Apostles; neither doth Christ in that place speak directly of a council, but of His Apostles' preaching and doctrine.

3. As for Christ's "being with them unto the end of the world," the fathers are so various, that, in the sense of the ancient Church, we may understand Him present in majesty,[22] in power,[23] in aid and assistance[24] against the difficulties they should find for preaching Christ; which is the native sense, as I take it: and this promise was made to support their weakness. As for His presence "in teaching by the Holy Ghost,"[25] few mention it; and no one of them which doth, speaks of any infallible assistance, farther than the succeeding Church keeps to the word of the Apostles, as the Apostles kept to the guidance of the Spirit. Besides, the

for the sake of the Council itself as for the sake of the Universal Church.]

[22] Loquebatur enim, (sc. *Johan.* cap. xii. 8. Me autem non semper habebitis,) de præsentia corporis Sui. Nam secundum majestatem Suam, secundum providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et invisibilem gratiam, impletur quod ab Eo dictum est, Ecce Ego vobiscum, etc. [For He spoke (sc. *John* xii. 8, Me ye have not always with you) about the presence of His body. For with regard to His majesty, with regard to His providence, with regard to His ineffable and invisible grace, that is fulfilled which He spoke, Lo, I am with you always.]—S. Augustin. in *Johan.* [*Evang.* cap. xii.] Tract. l. [*Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 634. A. Migne, iii. 1763.]—[Christus in cœlum ascendens, discessit quidem carne, sed præsens est majestate, secundum illud, quod ait; Ecce Ego vobiscum, etc. Christ ascending to the skies, departed indeed in the flesh, but is present in majesty, according as He says, Lo, I am with you always.]—S. Isidor. [Hispalens.] *Sentent.* lib. i. cap. 14. [§ 17. *Op.*, tom. vi. p. 151. ed. Lorenzanæ.]

[23] S. Hilar. [Pictav. *Tractat.*] in *Ps.* cxxiv. [cap. 7. *Op.*, col. 405. C.]—S. Justin. Martyr. *Dialog. cum Tryphone.* [There is no passage in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*—nor does there appear to be one in any of his works—which comments on the text announcing our Lord's perpetual presence in the Church.]—S. Prosper. [Aquitan. seu potius, ignoti auctoris,] *ad Demetriadem* [*virgin.*] *Epist.* [cap. 13. apud S. Prosper. *Op.*, col. 945. A. Migne rejects this.]

[24] [Sciens ergo Dominus, etc.] S. Hilar. in *Ps.* cxxiv. [Migne, i. 683.]—S. Prosper. [Aquitan. seu potius, ignoti auctoris,] *de vocat.* [*omn.*] *gentium*, lib. ii. cap. 2. [apud S. Prosper. *Op.*, col. 888. D. Migne, 688.]—S. Leon. [Magn.] *de Resurrect. Domini*, Serm. ii. cap. 3. [Serm. lxxii. (al. lxx.) *Op.*, tom. i. col. 286. ed. Ballerini. *ubi sup.* p. 187. note 14. Migne, i. 391.]—S. Isidor. [Hispalens.] in *Josue*, cap. xii. [*ubi sup.* p. 187. note 14.]

[25] ['Ιδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ. ἔπεμψε δὲ ἡμῖν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὸν παράκλητον, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐν ᾧ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐστι καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν αὐλίζεται, οὐκ ὀθνεῖον ἡμῖν ἐγχέων, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἴδιον πνεῦμα. Behold I am with you always, etc.; then He sent to us the Comforter from heaven, through Whom and in Whom He is with us and dwells in us, pouring out upon us no foreign Spirit, but the very personal Spirit of His Being, and of His Father's Being.]—S. Cyril. [Alexandr.] *de* [*Sancta*] *Trinitat.* dialog. vii. [*Op.*, tom. v. p. 642. A. ed. Aubert. Venet. 1638. Migne, viii. 1093.]—S. Prosper. [Aquitan. seu potius, ignot. auctor.] *ad Demetriad.* [*ubi sup.* note 23.]

[CHAPTER X.]

faith, where is the infallibility of the council that in your doctrine depends upon it?

6. The next place is Bellarmine's choice one, and his first; and he says, "it is a proper place for proof of the infallibility of General Councils."[35] This place is Christ's promise: "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them"; and He tells us, "the strength of the argument is not taken from these words alone, but as they are continued with the former; and that the argument is drawn *a minori ad majus*, 'from the less to the greater.'"[36] Thus: "If two or three gathered together in My name do always obtain that which they ask at God's hands, to wit, wisdom and knowledge of those things which are necessary for them, how much more shall all the bishops gathered together" in a council "always obtain wisdom and knowledge to judge those things which belong to the direction of the whole Church?"[37] I answer, first: It is most true that

Matt. xviii. 19, 20.

[35] Testimonia propria sunt tria: primum est *Matt.* xviii. (19.) [ubi sunt duo, etc. The proper pieces of evidence are three. The first is *St. Matt.* xviii. 19: "Where two or three are gathered together."]—Bellarmin. *de concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 2. § 3. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 53. C. The title of the chapter is: Concilia generalia a pontifice confirmata, errare non posse, ex Scripturis demonstratur. That General Councils confirmed by the pope cannot err is demonstrated by Scripture.]—[Ad tertium dicendum, quod] firmitas conciliorum illis [Christi] verbis *proprie* non innititur: [quia nec Christus ibi de conciliis episcoporum loquitur, sed de quavis fidelium unanimi congregatione; nec etsi Christus adsit in medio talium, tamen ad omnem affectum adest, aut ad hunc qui est judicare de fide. Thirdly, we must say that the certainty of councils does not properly rest on those words of Christ; because neither did Christ speak then about councils of bishops, but about a certain unanimous congregation of the faithful; nor, though Christ were present in the midst of such, is He present for every purpose, nor for this special purpose that they should judge about faith].—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. [de medio judic. Eccles. in causa fidei,] Q[uæst.] iii. A[rtic.] 4. [Respons.] ad 3.—Non locus hic [evangelii] *proprie* accommodari debet. [This passage of the Gospel ought not properly to be applied.]—[Gregor. de] Valentia, [*Commentar. Theologic.*] in [Secund. Secund.] S. Thom. [Aquin.] tom. iii. Disp. i. [de fide,] Q[uæst.] 1. [de objecto fidei,] Punct. vii. § 45. [de Conciliis, col. 320. C. ed. Paris. 1609.]

[36] Addita argumentatione a minori ad majus.—Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 2. § 3. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 54. A.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rtic.] 4. [*ut sup.* note 35. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 822. A.]

[37] [Quorum verborum hæc sententia est:] Si duo vel tres congregati in nomine Meo, obtinent semper quod petunt a Deo, [nimirum sapientiam, et lumen, quod sufficit eis ad cognoscenda ea, quæ ipsis necessaria sunt, quanto magis episcopi omnes congregati in nomine Meo, semper obtinebunt, quod juste petunt, id est, sapientiam, et lumen ad indicanda ea, quæ ad totam ecclesiam dirigendam pertinent. Of which words this is the meaning: If two or three gathered together in My name always get what they ask from God, particularly wisdom and light, which is sufficient for them to make them know those things which are necessary to themselves; how much more will all the bishops gathered together in My name

here is little strength in these words alone; for though the fathers make different interpretations of this place of Scripture, yet most of them agree in this, That this place is to be understood of consent in prayer:[38] and this is manifest enough in the text itself. Secondly, I think there is as little strength in them by the argument drawn *a minori ad majus;* and that I prove two ways. First, because though that argument hold in natural and necessary things, yet I doubt it holds not either in voluntary or promised things, or things which depend upon their institution: for he that promises the less, doth not hereby promise the greater; and he which will do the less, will not always do the greater. Secondly, because this argument from the less to the greater can never follow but where and so far as the thing upon which the argument is founded agrees to the less; for if it do not always agree to the less, it cannot necessarily pass from thence to the greater. Now, that upon which this argument is grounded here, is infallible hearing and granting the prayers of two or three met together in the name of Christ; but this infallibility is not always found in this less congregation where two or three are gathered together. For they

always obtain what they rightly ask for, *i.e.* wisdom and light, to point out those things which concern the direction of the whole Church.]—Bellarmin. *ibid.* § 4.

[38] Ubi duo vel tres pari spiritu et voluntate collecti sunt, etc. [When two or three are gathered together with a like spirit and will, etc.] [*καὶ γὰρ ἀπειλήσας ἐκεῖνα τῇ φιλονεικίᾳ, τὰ μεγάλα ἐνταῦθα τῆς συμφωνίας τίθησιν ἔταθλα· εἴγε καὶ τὸν πάτερα πείθουσιν οἱ συμφωνοῦντες, ὑπὲρ ὧν αἰτοῦσι, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ἔχουσιν εἰς τὸ μέσον.* For having spoken these threats against the love of strife, He next sets forth the great rewards of concord; since the men who agree together also persuade the Father to give them what they ask, and they have Christ in their midst.]—S. Chrysostom. *Hom.* [lx. al.] lxi. *in Matth.* xviii. [20. *Op.*, tom. vii. p. 608. D.]—[*συνάγει ἡμᾶς διὰ τῶν τοιούτων ῥημάτων εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην· ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐκώλυσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ σκανδαλίζειν ἀλλήλους, καὶ βλάπτειν καὶ βλάπτεσθαι, νῦν λέγει καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους συμφωνίας· συμφωνοῦντες δὲ νοοῦνται, οὐχ οἱ ἐπὶ κακῷ συνερχόμενοι, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ· ὅρα γὰρ τί εἶπεν· ἐὰν δύο ὑμῶν, τουτέστι τῶν πιστευόντων, τῶν ἐναρέτων . . . ὥστε διὰ τοῦτο πολλάκις εὐχόμενοι οὐ λαμβάνομεν, διότι οὐδὲ συμφωνίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχομεν·* He gathers us all to love by such sayings; for since He has forbidden us to put stumbling blocks in one another's way, and to hurt or to be hurt, now He speaks also about agreeing among ourselves; but by those who agree is meant, not those who come together for an evil purpose, but those who come together for a good purpose. For see what He said, If two of you, *i.e.* of those who believe, the virtuous. This is the reason why we often do not receive when we pray, because we have not agreement one with the other.]—Theophyl. *in* [*loc.* (sc.] *Matth.* xviii. [20.) p. 106. D.]—S. Cyprian. lib. iv. *Epist.* 4. [de unitate ecclesiæ, *Op.*, p. 198. ed. Benedict.]—Ipse enim quia pax et charitas est, sedem et habitationem in bonis atque pacificis voluntatibus collocabit.] For He Himself also, since He is peace and love, will set His seat and His abode among the good and peaceful.—S. Hilar. in *Matth.* xviii. [20. apud Catenam Auream. Migne, i. 1022.]

[CHAPTER X.]

often meet and pray, yet obtain not; because "there are divers other conditions necessarily required," as St. Chrysostom observes, "to make the prayers of a congregation heard," beside their gathering together in the name of Christ;[39] and therefore it is not extended to a greater congregation or council, unless the same conditions be still observed: neither doth Christ's promise, *Ero in medio*, "I will be in the midst of them," infer that they—the greater or the less, three or three hundred—have all, even necessary things, infallibly granted unto them as oft as they ask, if they ask not as well *as* they ought as *what* they ought.[40] And yet most true it is, that where more or fewer are gathered together in the name of Christ, there is He in the midst of them—but to assist and to grant whatsoever He shall find fit for them, not infallibly whatsoever they shall think fit to ask for themselves; and therefore St. Cyprian, though he use this very argument, *a minori*

[39] Quomodo igitur a Patre cuncta non consequentur? Quia multæ sunt causæ non impetrandi, etc. [Πῶς οὖν οὐ πάντα ἐπιτυγχάνουσιν; ὅτι πολλαὶ αἱ αἰτίαι τοῦ ἀποτυγχάνειν· ἡ γὰρ ἀσύμφορα πολλάκις αἰτοῦσι. καὶ τί θαυμάζεις εἰ ἕτεροι τινες, ὅπουγε καὶ Παῦλος τοῦτο ἔπαθεν, ἡνίκα ἤκουσεν, ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου. How, then, do they not obtain all things? There are many causes of their failure to obtain; for either they often ask unsuitable things. And why do you wonder if some others have to bear this, for Paul also had to bear it when he heard, "My strength is sufficient for thee."]—S. Chrysostom. *Hom.* [lx. al. lxi.] *in Matth.* xviii. [20. *Op.*, tom. vii. p. 608. D.]—Et Bellarminus ipse, [his verbis: sc.] Si congregari in nomine Christi sit nota Ecclesiæ, [certe] non erit congregari quomodocunque [in nomine Christi:] sic enim omnes hæreses et schismata congregantur in nomine Christi. Sed [erit congregari ab illis, qui funguntur Christi auctoritate, quales sunt episcopi legitime ordinati, etc. And Bellarmine himself in these words, sc.: If to be gathered together in the name of Christ is a mark of the Church, certainly it does not mean to be gathered anyhow in the name of Christ; for so all sects and schisms are gathered in the name of Christ; but it will mean to be gathered together by those who exercise Christ's authority, and they are the bishops lawfully ordained.—Bellarmin.] *de notis ecclesiæ*, lib. iv. cap. 2. § 16.

[40] Nec etsi Christus adsit in medio talium, tamen ad omnem effectum adest, aut ad hunc qui est judicare de fide. [Nor, although Christ be present in the midst of them, is He present for every purpose, and not for this specific purpose that they should judge about faith.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rtic.] 4. [*ubi sup.* p. 272. note 35.—At dixit Deus se fore in medio eorum. Certe dixit, et est in medio ipsorum ut Deus; etiam in medio errantium, ne aberrent ad mortem:] sed nec illi semper ad Deum respiciunt, qui in medio ipsorum est: nec Deus sic adest iis qui respiciunt ad Ipsum, ut omnem veritatem doceat in instanti et omni tempore simul: [omnem veritatem docet, nos vero successive capimus. But God said He would be in the midst of them. He certainly said it, and is in the midst of them as God, also in the midst of the erring lest they err to death; but neither do they always look to God Who is in the midst of them, nor is God so present to those who do look to Him as to teach them all truth in one and the same time at once; He teaches us all truth; we take it piece by piece.—Fr.] Junius in Bellarmin. [*Controv.* iv.] *de Concil.* [*et Eccles.*] lib. ii. in cap. 2. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1070. ed. Genevæ, 1613.]

ad majus, "from the less to the greater," yet he presumes not to extend it as Bellarmine doth, to the obtaining of infallibility; but only useth it in the general way, in which there neither is nor can be doubt of the truth of it. Thus: "If two that are of one mind to Godward can do so much, what might be done if there were unanimity among all Christians?"[41] Undoubtedly more, but not all whatsoever they should ask, unless all other requisites were present. Thirdly: In this their own great champions[42] disagree from Bellarmine, or he from them. For Gregory de Valentia and Stapleton tell us, "That this place doth not belong properly to prove an infallible certainty of any sentence in which more agree in the name of Christ, but to the efficacy of consent for obtaining that which more shall pray for in the name of Christ, if at least that be for their souls' health: For else you may prove out of this place, that not only the definition of a General Council, but even of a provincial—nay, of two or three bishops gathered together,—is valid, and that without the pope's assent."

7. The last place mentioned for the infallibility of General Councils is that, where the Apostles say of themselves and the council held by them, "It seems good to the Holy Ghost and to us." And they might well say it; for they had infallibly the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and they kept close to His direction. But I do not find that any General Council since, though they did implore, as they ought, the assistance of that blessed Spirit, did ever take upon them to say, *in terminis*, "in express terms,"

Acts xv. 28.

[41] Si duo unanimes tantum possunt; quid, si unanimitas apud omnes esset? [If two by agreeing can do so much, what would come if all agreed?]—S. Cypr. lib. iv. *Epist.* iv. [*de unitate ecclesiæ.*] The words are not exactly quoted; Laud gives the sense.

[42] Non ad infallibilem certitudinem alicujus sententiæ, in quam plures in nomine Christi consentiant, locus hic Evangelii proprie accommodari debet, sed ad efficaciam consensionis plurium ad id impetrandum, quod unanimiter in Christi nomine petunt, si id quidem ad eorum salutem expediat. Secus enim non modo ex illo loco probabitur, etc. [To prove the infallible certainty of some opinions to which several agree in the name of Christ, this passage of the Gospel ought not properly to be used. It should be used to prove the efficacy of the agreement of many in asking that for which they pray with one heart in the name of Christ, supposing, of course, that this will help their salvation. For otherwise this passage will not prove it.]—Greg. de Valen. tom. ii. in Thom. *Disput.* i. Q[uæst.] i. Punct. vii. § 45. [*ubi sup.* p. 272. note 35.] And although Stapleton approves this argument *a minori ad majus*, yet withal he says: Firmitas conciliorum illis Christi verbis proprie non innititur: quia nec Christus ibi de conciliis episcoporum loquitur, sed de quavis fidelium unanimi congregatione. Nec etsi, etc. [The certainty of councils does not specially rest on those words of Christ, because Christ is not there speaking of councils of bishops; He is speaking of a certain unanimous congregation of faithful souls.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rt.] 4. [*ubi sup.* p. 272. note 35.]

[CHAPTER X.]

of their definitions, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis*, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us";—acknowledging even thereby, as I conceive, a great deal of difference in the certainty of those things which a General Council, at after, determined in the Church, and those which were settled by the Apostles when they sat in council. But though I do not find, that they used this speech punctually, and "in terms," yet the fathers, when they met in council, were confident, and spake it out, that they had assistance from the Holy Ghost; yet so, as that they neither took themselves, nor the councils they sat in, as infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost, as the Apostles were. And Valentia is very right: "That though the council say they are gathered together in the Holy Ghost, yet the fathers are neither arrogant in using the speech, nor yet infallible, for all that."[43] And this is true, whether the pope approve or disapprove their definitions; though Valentia will not admit that: the pope must be, with him, infallible, whatever come of it. Now though this be but an example, and include no precept, yet both Stapleton[44] and Bellarmine[45] make this place a proper proof of the infallibility of General Councils; and Stapleton[46] says the decrees of councils

[43] Quintum argumentum: [Concilii patres asserunt se in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregari: itemque statuunt sub anathemate, etc. At nisi infallibiliter per se definiunt, arroganter id quidem ab illis vel dici vel fieri videri posset.] Aut sunt igitur arrogantes, quod putandum non est, aut infallibiliter [profecto] definiunt. [Respondeo: In Spiritu Sancto legitime congregare concilium non aliud est, quam omnino placere Deo. The fifth reason is: The fathers of the council declare themselves lawfully gathered together in the Holy Spirit; and so they make laws under an anathema, etc. But unless they can define infallibly, it is evident that they say and do this with overmuch pride. Therefore, either they are overproud, which cannot be thought for a moment, or they do really define infallibly. I answer, for a council to gather together in the Holy Spirit lawfully means nothing less than that they please God entirely. — Gregor. de] Valentia [sic] respondet concedendo neutrum: [*Commentar. Theolog.*] in [Secund. Secund.] S. Thom. [Aquin.] tom. iii. Disp. i. [de fide,] Q[uæst.] 1. [de objecto fidei,] Punct. vii. § 45. [col. 321. D.]

[44] Ad tertium, exemplo primi concilii apostolici eorum firmitas nititur, [vel aliis Christi in Evangelio promissionibus apostolis suis proprie factis. Thirdly, their certainty rests on the example of the first Apostolic Council, or on other promises of Christ in the Gospel made specially to His apostles.] —Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. etc. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rtic.] 4. [Respons.] ad 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. pp. 821, 822. *ubi sup.* p. 272. note 35.]

[45] Et Bellarminus dicit locum hunc esse tertium e propriis. [And Bellarmine says that this passage is the third of the special passages.] [His words are:] Tertius locus [est *Act.* xv. ubi primum concilium confidenter ait: Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis. The third passage is *Act.* xv., where the first council says with confidence, "It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."—Bellarmin.] *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 2. § [7.]

[46] [Sed contra est quod in primo concilio apostolico dicitur: *Act.* xv. Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis.

are "the very oracles of the Holy Ghost," which is little short of blasphemy; and Bellarmine adds, that because "all other councils borrowed their form from this, therefore other lawful councils may affirm also that their decrees are the decrees of the Holy Ghost";[47] little considering therewhile, that it is one thing to borrow the form, and another thing to borrow the certainty and the infallibility, of a council. For suppose that after-councils did follow the form of that first council exactly in all circumstances, yet I hope no advised man will say there is the like infallibility in other councils, where no man sat that was inspired, as was in this, where all that sat as judges were inspired; or if any Jesuit will be so bold as to say it, he had need bring very good proof for it, and far better than any is brought yet. Now that all councils are not so infallible as was this of the Apostles, nor the causes handled in them as there they were, is manifest by one of their own, who tells us plainly, "That the Apostles in their council dealt very prudently; did not precipitate their judgment, but weighed all things; for in matters of faith, and which touch the conscience, it is not enough to say *Volumus et mandamus*, 'We will and command.' And thus the Apostles met together in simplicity and singleness, seeking nothing but God and the salvation of men. And what wonder if the Holy Ghost were present in such a council? *Nos aliter*: but 'we meet otherwise,' in great pomp; and seek ourselves, and promise ourselves, that we may do anything out of the plenitude of our power. And how can the Holy Ghost allow of such meetings?"[48] And if not "allow" or

Ergo] conciliorum decreta sunt Spiritus Sancti oracula. [But the opposite is said in the first Apostolic Council, *Acts* xv.; it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us. Therefore, the decrees of councils are the oracles of the Holy Spirit.]—Stapleton. *ibid. Sentent. Orthodox.* i. [*ut sup.* p. 820. B.]

[47] Si illud concilium, ex quo formam acceperunt omnia alia concilia, asserit decreta sua esse decreta Spiritus Sancti, certe idem asserere possunt cætera legitima concilia, etc. [If that council, from which all other councils have derived their form, asserts its decrees to be decrees of the Holy Spirit; certainly the other lawful councils can assert the same.]—Bellarmin. *ibid.* [*ut sup.* note 45.]

[48] Vide quam prudenter agunt, non præcipitant sententiam, sed singula expendunt. In rebus enim fidei et quæ conscientiam tangunt, non satis est dicere *Volumus, mandamus*. Vides igitur quomodo conveniunt Apostoli. Simpliciter conveniunt, nihil nisi Deum quærunt, et aliorum salutem expetunt, [denique omnia prudenter perpendunt.] Quid igitur mirum si in hoc concilio fuerit Spiritus Sanctus? [Juxta promissum Domini, ubi duo vel tres congregati fuerint, etc.] Nos aliter convenimus, nempe, cum magna pompa, nosque ipsos quærimus, atque nobis pollicemur nihil nobis non licere de plenitudine potestatis. Et quomodo Spiritus Sanctus ejusmodi conventus probare possit? [See how prudently they act, they are in no hurry about the decision, but they weigh each point. For in

[CHAPTER X.]

approve the meetings, then certainly not concur to make everything infallible that shall be concluded in them.

8. And for all the places together, weigh them with indifferency, and either they speak of the Church, including the Apostles, as all of them do—and then, all grant the voice of the Church is God's voice, divine and infallible;—or else they are general, unlimited, and appliable to private assemblies as well as General Councils, which none grant to be infallible but some mad enthusiasts;—or else they are limited, not simply into "all truth," but "all necessary to salvation"; in which I shall easily grant a General Council cannot err, suffering itself to be led by this Spirit of truth in the Scripture, and not taking upon it to lead both the Scripture and the Spirit. For, suppose these places, or any other, did promise assistance, even to infallibility, yet they granted it not to every General Council, but to the Catholic body of the Church itself; and if it be in the whole Church principally, then is it in a General Council but by consequent, as the Council represents the whole. And that which belongs to a thing by consequent, doth not otherwise nor longer belong unto it than it consents and cleaves to that upon which it is a consequent. And therefore a General Council hath not this assistance, but as it keeps to the whole Church and spouse of Christ, whose it is to

matters of faith and which concern the conscience, it is not enough to say, we wish, we command. You see therefore how the Apostles assemble. They assemble simply, they ask for nothing but for God, and they seek the salvation of others; and then they weigh everything with prudence. What wonder then is there, if the Holy Spirit was present in this council; according to the Lord's promise "Where two or three are gathered together." We gather together in a different fashion, with great pomp, and we seek ourselves and promise ourselves that nothing is unlawful to us in the fulness of our powers. And how can the Holy Spirit approve such a gathering as this?]—Ferus in *Act.* xv. 7. [p. 180. ed. Colon. 1567.—Joannis Feri Franciscani Opera omnia in Romano indice (Clem. VIII. an. 1595.) prohibita sunt, exceptis annotationibus et commentariis in Matth. et Joann. Evangelia, et in Joannis Epist. 1. Romæ recognitis et impressis. All the works of John Ferus the Franciscan are forbidden in the Roman Index, except the notes and commentaries on the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John and on the 1st Epistle of St. John, allowed and printed at Rome.—Possevin. *Apparat. Sacr.* p. 875. (quoted by Thorold, T. C., *Laud's Labyrinth*, p. 254.) In a Portuguese Index Expurg.: sc. Index auctorum damnatæ memoriæ, Ulyssipp. 1624. p. 782. the Commentary on the Acts is expurgated. In the Index of Madrid, 1640. Index Libb. prohib. et expurg. de concilio supremæ Senat. S. General. Inquisit. Joannes Ferus, fraude sectariorum vitiatus [spoilt by the deceits of sectaries], (p. 706.) is expurgated in the Commentaries on St. Matthew's and St. John's Gospel,—St. John 1st Epist.—and St. Paul to the Romans: Cætera ejus opera, sectariis vitiata, prohib. donec recognoscantur. The rest of his works, spoilt by sectaries, are forbidden, till permission is given. —(p. 712.) The same in the Index of Madrid, 1667.]

hear His word, and determine by it. And therefore if a General Council will go out of the Church's way, it may easily go without the Church's truth. SECTION XXXIII.

1. Fourthly, I consider, that all agree, That the Church in general can never err from the faith necessary to salvation; no persecution, no temptation, no "gates of hell," whatsoever is meant by them, can ever so "prevail against it." For all the members of the militant Church cannot err, either in the whole faith, or in any article of it; it is impossible. For if all might so err, there could be no union between them as members, and Christ the head; and no union between head and members, no body; and so no Church; which cannot be. But there is not the like consent, That General Councils cannot err.[49] And it seems strange to me, the fathers having to do with so many heretics, and so many of them opposing Church authority, that in the condemnation of those heretics, this proposition, even in terms, "A General Council cannot err," should not be found in any one of them, that I can yet see. Now suppose it were true, that no General Council had erred in any matter of moment to this day—which will not be found true—yet this would not have followed, That it is therefore infallible, and cannot err. I have no time to descend into particulars; therefore to the general, still. St. Augustine[50] puts a difference between the rules of

Consid. IV.

Matt. xvi. 18.

[49] Ecclesia catholica fidem habet indefectibilem, etc. . . . [Nec utique particularis illa Romana, sed] universalis ecclesia, non quidem in generali synodo congregata, quam aliquoties errasse precepimus, etc. [The Catholic Church has an indefectible faith; not assuredly the particular Roman but the universal Church, nor indeed the Church assembly gathered together in a general Council, which we have often seen to have erred, etc.]—[Thom.] Waldens. *Doctrinal. Fidei*, [tom. i.] lib. ii. Artic. ii. cap. xix. § 1., Et § 38. No. 4. [fol. xcix. etc. *ubi sup.* p. 261. note 4.]

[50] [Vos certe nobis objicere soletis Cypriani literas, Cypriani sententiam, Cypriani concilium: cur auctoritatem Cypriani pro vestro schismate assumitis, et ejus exemplum pro ecclesiæ pace respuitis? Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonicam, tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus posterioribus episcoporum literis ita præponi, ut de illa omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit, utrum verum vel utrum rectum sit, quidquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit: episcoporum autem literas quæ post confirmatum canonem vel scriptæ sunt vel scribuntur, et per sermonem forte sapientiorem cujuslibet in ea re peritioris, et per aliorum episcoporum graviorem auctoritatem doctioremque prudentiam, et per concilia licere reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est: et ipsa concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati quæ fiunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere: ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari; cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat. You certainly are accustomed often to oppose us with Cyprian's letters, Cyprian's decision, Cyprian's council: why do you assume the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and refuse his

[CHAPTER X.]

Scripture, and the definitions of men. This difference is, *Præponitur Scriptura*, "That the Scripture hath the prerogative." That prerogative is, "That whatsoever is found written in Scripture, may neither be doubted nor disputed whether it be true or right. But the letters of bishops may not only be disputed, but corrected, by bishops that are more learned and wise than they, or by National Councils; and National Councils, by Plenary or General; and even Plenary Councils themselves may be amended, the former by the later."[51] It seems it was no news with St. Augustine, that a General Council might err; and therefore inferior to the Scripture, which may neither be doubted nor disputed where it affirms. And if it be so with the "definition" of a council too, as Stapleton[52] would have it, that that may neither be doubted nor disputed, where is then the Scripture's prerogative?

2. I know there is much shifting about this place, but it cannot be wrastled off. Stapleton says first, "That St. Augustine speaks of the rules of manners and discipline."[53] And this is Bellarmine's last shift. Both are out, and Bellarmine in a contra-

example for the peace of the Church. For who does not know that the Canonical Holy Scriptures, both of the old and new Testaments, are contained in their own fixed bounds, (and therefore can have no later additions), and that they are preferred to all later letters of bishops, so that there can be no dispute or division about them, as to whether any point which is clearly written in them is true or right; but as for the letters of bishops which have been written, or are being written, after the Canon was settled, they may be corrected either by the wiser explanations of some more skilful theologian, or by the higher authority and more learned foresight of other bishops, and by councils, if there is in them any departure from the truth; and those councils too which are held in separate districts or provinces ought to give way without any evasions, to the authority of General Councils which are gathered from the whole Christian world; and of the General Councils themselves the earlier are often amended by the later. Experience explains what had been incomprehensible.]—S. Augustin. *de Baptismo contra Donatist.* lib. ii. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 98. A. Migne, ix. 128.]

[51] Ipsaque plenaria sæpe priora a posterioribus emendari.—[*ut sup.* note 50.]

[52] Est [autem] ecclesiæ [testificantis et docentis] vox [sic ab omnibus fidelibus audienda,] ut non de ea judicemus rectene an secus docuerit, [sed satis nobis sit quod ecclesia hoc vel illud docuerit. But the voice of the Church testifying and teaching is to be heard by all the faithful with such reverence that we should not attempt to decide whether it teaches right or otherwise; but it should be enough for us that the Church has taught this or that.]—So Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] iv. [de potestate ecclesiæ in se,] Q[uæst.] i. A[rtic.] 1. [Respons. ad 7. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 731. B.]

[53] Ad primum [ergo dicendum, quod Augustinus loquitur] de regulis morum ac disciplinæ. [First, therefore, we must say that Augustine speaks about the rules for manners and for discipline.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rtic.] 4. [Respons.] ad 1. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 821. C.]

diction. Bellarmine in a contradiction; for first he tells us, "General Councils cannot err in precepts of manners";[54] and then, to turn off St. Augustine in this place, he tells us, "That if St. Augustine doth not speak of matter of fact, but of right, and of universal questions of right, then he is to be understood[55] of precepts of manners, not of points of faith": where he hath first run himself upon a contradiction; and then we have gained this ground upon him, That either his answer is nothing; or else, against his own state of the question, "A General Council can err in precepts of manners." So, belike, when Bellarmine is at a shift, a General Council can, and cannot, err in precepts of manners. And both are out; for the whole dispute of St. Augustine is against the error of St. Cyprian, followed by the Donatists, which was an error in faith—namely: "That true baptism could not be given by heretics, and such as were out of the Church." And the proof which Stapleton and Bellarmine draw out of the subsequent words, "When by any experiment of things, that which was shut is opened,"[56] is too weak. For experiment there is not, of fact; nor are the words, *Conclusum est*, as if it were of a rule of discipline concluded, as Stapleton cites them, but a farther experiment or proof of the question in hand, and pertaining to faith, which was then shut up, and, as St. Augustine after speaks, "wrapped up in cloudy darkness."[57]

3. Next, Stapleton will have it, That if St. Augustine do speak of a cause of faith, then his meaning is, that later General Councils can mend, that is, "explicate more perfectly, that faith

[54] [Catholici vero omnes constanter docent, Concilia generalia a summo pontifice confirmata, errare non posse, nec in fide explicanda, nec in tradendis morum præceptis toti ecclesiæ communibus. [But all Catholics consistently teach that General Councils confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff cannot err, neither in explaining faith, nor in delivering to the whole Church general precepts as to conduct.—Bellarmin.] *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 2. in init. [§. 1. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 53. D.]

[55] Potest etiam [tertio dici, si contendant adversarii eum loqui de universalibus quæstionibus, Concilia priora emendari per posteriora, quoad præcepta morum, non quoad dogmata fidei; præcepta enim mutantur juxta temporum, locorum, et personarum mutationes, etc. [In the third place we may say, if our adversaries contend that he is speaking about universal questions, that earlier councils are amended by later councils, with regard to rules of conduct, not with regard to dogmas of faith; for rules of conduct are changed according to the changes in seasons, places and persons.—Bellarmin.] *ibid.* cap. 7. [§ 8. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 62. B.]

[56] Cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat. [When that which had been shut is opened after some experience of things.]—[*ut sup.* note 50.]

[57] Nebulis involuta. [Involved in mists.]—S. Augustin. *ibid.* cap. 4. [col. 98. F.]

[Chapter X.]

[Constantinople Editt. 1673 and 1686.]

which lay hid in the seed of ancient doctrine."[58] He makes instance, That about the divinity of Christ, the council of Ephesus explicated the first of Nice; Chalcedon, both of them; Constance, Chalcedon. And then concludes: "In all which things, none of" (these) "councils taught that which was erroneous."[59] An excellent conclusion! These councils, and these in this thing, taught no error, and were only explained; Therefore no council can err in any matter of faith;—or, Therefore St. Augustine speaks not of an emendation of error, but of an explanation of sense. Whereas every eye sees neither of these can follow.

4. Now that St. Augustine meant plainly, That even a Plenary Council might err, and that "often,"[60] (for that is his word,) and that in matter of faith, and might and ought so to be amended in a later council, I think will thus appear. First, his word is, *emendari*, "to be amended"; which properly supposes for error and faultiness, not explanation. And St. Augustine needed not to go to a word of such a forced[61] sense; nor sure would, especially in a disputation against adversaries. Next, St. Augustine's dispute is against St. Cyprian and the council held at Carthage about Baptism by Heretics; in which point that National Council erred, as now all agree. And St. Augustine's deduction goes on: Scripture

[58] Sensus est, quod posteriora concilia emendant, id est, perfectius explicant fidem in semine antiquæ doctrinæ latentem, etc. [The meaning is that later councils amend, *i.e.* explain more perfectly the faith which was latent in the seed of the older doctrine.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rt.] 4. [*ubi sup.* p. 280. note 53.]

[59] Qua in re nihil erroneum ullum concilium docuit, [sed posteriora perfectius quam priora, propter novas hæreses insurgentes, quibus quasi novis morbis nova definitionum remedia aptanda fuerant. In which matter no council taught anything erroneous; but the later ones taught more perfectly than the earlier, on account of the growth of new heresies, for which as for new diseases new remedies of definitions had to be provided.—Stapleton. *ibid.* p. 821. D.]

[60] Sæpe.—[S. Augustin. *ubi sup.* note 50.]

[61] Not used, but either for *corrigere* or *auferre;* and so St. Augustine uses the word: [Sed aliud est quod docemus, aliud quod sustinemus, aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur et donec emendemus, tolerare compellimur. But what we teach is one thing, what we sustain is another, what we are bidden to direct another, and yet another what we are bidden to amend, and are obliged to put up with, till we do amend it.—S. Augustin.] *contra Faustum* [*Manichæum,*] lib. xx. cap. 21. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 348. A.]—And Bellarmine, though he interpret it in matter of fact, yet equals the word with *correxit*, [in these words:] Respondeo, quæstionem [fuisse de facto . . . . Quia vero Johannes postea re melius investigata . . . correxit errorem concilii prioris, juxta regulam Augustini, qui dicit: Concilia priora aliquando emendari, etc. I answer that the question was one of fact . . . because John, after the matter had been more thoroughly investigated, . . . corrected the error of the earlier council, according to Augustine's rule, who says, That earlier councils sometimes are amended by later, etc.—Bellarmin.] *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 8. § 72.

cannot be other than right; that is the prerogative of it: but bishops may, and be "reprehended[62] for it, if peradventure they err from the truth,"[63] and that either by "more learned bishops," or "by Provincial Councils." Here reprehension, and that for deviation from the truth, is, I hope, "emendation" properly, and not "explanation" only. Then Provincial Councils, they must "yield"[64] to General; and to yield is not in case of explanation, only. Then it follows, that even "Plenary Councils themselves may be amended, the former by the later"; still retaining that which went before, "if peradventure they erred, or made deviation from the truth." And if this be not so, I would fain know why, in one and the same tenor of words, in one and the same continuing argument and deduction of St. Augustine, *reprehendi* should be in proper sense, and *a veritate deviatum* in proper sense, and *cedere* in proper sense, and only *emendari* should not be proper, but stand for an "explanation"? If you say the reason is, because the former words are applied to men and National Councils, both which may err, but this last to General Councils, which cannot err, this is most miserable begging of the principle and thing in question.

5. Again: St. Augustine concludes there, That the General Council preceding may be amended by General Councils that follow, "when that is known which lay hid before."[65] Not, as Stapleton would have it, "lay hid as in the seed of ancient doctrine" only, and so needed nothing but explanation; but hid in some darkness or ambiguity, which led the former into error and mistaking, as appears. For St. Augustine "would have this amendment made without sacrilegious pride,—doubtless, of insulting upon the former council that was to be amended—"and without swelling arrogancy,"—sure, against the weakness in the former council—"and without contention of envy,"—which uses to accompany man's frailty, where his or his friend's error is to be amended by the later council—"and in holy humility, in Catholic peace, in Christian charity,"—no question, that a schism be not made to tear the Church, (as here the Donatists did,) while one

[62] Reprehendi.—[S. Augustin. *ubi sup.* note 50.]

[63] Si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est. [If there had been any deviation from the truth by chance in them.]—[S. Augustin. *ubi sup.* note 50.]

[64] Cedere.—[S. Augustin. *ubi sup.* note 50.]

[65] Cum cognoscitur quod latebat.—[S. Augustin. *ubi sup.* note 50.]

[CHAPTER X.]

council goes to reform the lapse of another, if any be. Now to what end should this learned father be so zealous, in this work, this highest work that I know in the Church—reviewing and surveying General Councils—to keep off "pride," and "arrogance," and "envy," and to keep all in "humility," "peace," and "charity," —if, after all this noise, he thought later councils might do nothing but "amend," that is, "explain," the former?

6. That shift which Bellarmine[66] adds to these two of Stapleton is poorest of all—namely, "That St. Augustine speaks of unlawful councils; and it is no question but they may be amended, as the second Ephesine was at Chalcedon." For this answer hath no foundation but a "peradventure"; nor durst Bellarmine rest upon it. And most manifest it is, that St. Augustine speaks of councils in general, that they may err, and be amended in doctrine of faith; and in case they be not amended, that then they be condemned and rejected by the Church, as this of Ephesus and divers others were. And as for that mere trick of the pope's "instruction, approbation, or confirmation,"[67] to preserve it from error, or ratify it that it hath not erred, the most ancient Church knew it not. He had his suffrage, as other great patriarchs had; and his vote was highly esteemed, not only for his place, but for worth too, as popes were then. But that the whole council depended upon him and his confirmation, was then unknown, and I verily think at this day not believed, by the wise and learned of his adherents.

Consid. V.

1. Fifthly, it must be considered, If a General Council may err, who shall judge it? St. Augustine is at *priora a posterioribus*,[68] Nothing, sure, that is less than a General Council.[69] "Why, but this yet lays all open to uncertainties, and makes way for a whirlwind of a private spirit to ruffle the Church." No, neither of these. First, All is not open to uncertainties: for General Councils, lawfully called and ordered, and lawfully proceeding, are a great and an awful representation, and cannot err in matters of faith, keeping themselves to God's rule, and not attempting to make a

[66] Respondeo primo, forte [loqui Augustinum de conciliis illegitimis, quæ per posteriora legitima emendantur, ut accidit Concil. Ephesino II. quod in Chalcedonensi emendatum est. I answer in the first place that perhaps Augustine spoke of unlawful councils which are amended by later lawful ones, as happened to the 2nd Ephesian Council which was amended at that of Chalcedon].—Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 7 § 7. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 62. B.]

[67] Sec. xxvi. No. 1. [*ubi sup.* p. 221.]

[68] [S. Augustin. *ubi sup.* p. 279. note 50.]

[69] Sec. xxxii. No. 5. [*ubi sup.* p. 262.]

new of their own; and are with all submission to be observed by every Christian, where Scripture or evident demonstration come not against them. Nor doth it make way for the whirlwind of a private spirit; for private spirits are too giddy to rest upon Scripture, and too heady and shallow to be acquainted with demonstrative arguments. And it were happy for the Church if she might never be troubled with private spirits till they brought such arguments. I know this is hotly objected against Hooker,[70] the author[71] calls him a "wise Protestant,"[72] yet turns thus upon him: "If a Council must yield to a demonstrative proof, who shall judge whether the argument that is brought be a demonstration or not? For every man that will kick against the Church, will say the Scripture he urges is evident, and his reason a demonstration. And what is this but to leave all to the wildness of a private spirit?" Can any ingenuous man read this passage in Hooker and dream of a "private spirit"? For to the question, "Who shall judge?" Hooker answers as if it had been then made: "An

[70] ["Are those reasons demonstrative, are they necessary, or but mere probabilities only? An argument necessary and demonstrative is such, as being proposed unto any man and understood, the mind cannot choose but inwardly assent. Any one such reason dischargeth, I grant, the conscience, and setteth it at full liberty. For the public approbation given by the body of this whole Church unto those things which are established, doth make it but probable that they are good. And therefore unto a necessary proof that they are not good, it must give place. But if the skilfullest amongst you can show that all the books ye have hitherto written be able to afford any one argument of this nature, let the instance be given." —Hooker,] Preface [to *Eccl. Polity*, ch. vi. 6.] p. 29. [*Works*, vol. i. pp. 170, 171, ed. Church and Paget.]

[71] *Dialogus dictus, Deus et Rex.* [Dr. Scott says he has not been able to procure a sight of this rare volume. It was written (see Alegambe, *Scriptores Societatis Jesu*) by John Floyd, a Jesuit, commonly called, as Wood states, Father Fludd, and was published at S. Omer's (Audomari), 1620. It was translated into English by Thomas More, also a Jesuit, and published at Cologne, 1620. Thomas More was the brother of Henry More, the historian of the English Jesuits, and a member of one of the younger branches of Chancellor Sir T. More's family, and settled in Cambridgeshire. This Thomas More died at Ghent, 1623, æt. 37, and is not to be confounded with Thomas More, who died at Rome, 1625, æt. 59, the great-grandson of Sir Thomas More who conducted the affairs of the English Jesuits at Rome. The *Life of Sir Thomas More* is sometimes attributed to this latter Thomas More, but it was written by his younger and only surviving brother, Christopher Cresacre More. Consequently these, Thomas and Christopher, were cousins of Thomas More, the translator of Floyd. —Another work is extant under the title, *Deus et Rex, sive dialogus quo demonstratur serenissimum D. nostrum Jacobum Regem, immediate sub Deo constitutum in regnis suis, justissime sibi vindicare quicquid in juramento fidelitatis requiritur.* Cantabrigiæ, etc. 1615. Another edition was printed at London of the same date. A translation, 12mo. appeared, London, 1616: and a reprint was issued, London, 1663. This work is of a character opposite to that of Floyd.]

[72] Cordatus Protestans. [*Ibid.*]

[CHAPTER X.]

argument necessary and demonstrative, is such," saith he, "as, being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot choose but inwardly assent unto it."[73] So it is not enough to think or say it is "demonstrative." The light, then, of a "demonstrative argument" is the evidence which itself hath in itself to all that understand it. Well; but because all understand it not, if a quarrel be made, who shall decide it? No question but a "General Council,"[74] not a private spirit: first, in the intent of the author; for Hooker in all that discourse makes the "sentence of the Council"[75] binding, and therefore that is made "judge," not a private spirit. And then for the "judge of the argument," it is as plain: for if it be evident to any man, then to so many learned men as are in a Council, doubtless: and if they cannot but assent, it is hard to think them so impious that they will define against it. And if that which is thought evident to any man be not evident to such a grave assembly, it is probable it is no "demonstration," and the producers of it ought to rest, and not to trouble the Church.

2. Nor is this Hooker's alone, nor is it newly thought on by us. It is a ground in nature, which grace doth ever set right, never undermine. And St. Augustine[76] hath it twice in one chapter, that St. Cyprian and that Council at Carthage would have presently yielded to "any one that would demonstrate truth."[77] Nay, it is

[73] [Hooker,] Pref. p. 29. [*ubi sup.* note 70.] And therefore A. C. is much to blame, after all this, to talk of a "pretext of seeming evident Scripture, or demonstration"; as he doth, p. 59.

[74] Sec. xxxii. No. 2. [*ubi sup.* p. 260.]

[75] ["For if God be not the author of confusion, but of peace, then can He not be the author of our refusal, but of our contentment, to stand unto some definitive sentence . . . When the Council of Jerusalem had given their definitive sentence, all controversy was at an end. Things were disputed before they came to be determined: men afterwards were not to dispute any longer, but to obey . . . As for the orders which are established, sith equity and reason, the law of nature, God and man, do all favour that which is in being, till orderly judgment of decision be given against it, it is but justice to exact of you, and perverseness in you it should be to deny, thereunto your willing obedience."—Hooker,] Preface [etc., ch. vi. 3—5. *Works*, vol. i. pp. 167-170, ed. Church and Paget.]

[76] [Quapropter Sanctus Cyprianus, tanto excelsior, quanto humilior . . . satis ostendit facillime se correcturum fuisse sententiam suam, si quis ei demonstraret baptismum Christi sic dari posse ab eis qui foras exierunt, etc. Wherefore Saint Cyprian, so much higher and yet so much humbler . . . shows plainly how willing he was to correct his decision if any one could prove to him that Christian baptism could be given by those who had gone outside the Church, etc.—S. Augustin.] *de Baptism. contra Donatist.* lib ii. cap. 4. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 98. D. Migne, ix. 129.]

[77] [Quia profecto] uni verum dicenti, et demonstranti [posset facillime consentire tam sancta anima tam pacata, etc. For certainly it was very easy

a rule with him, "Consent of nations, authority confirmed by miracles and antiquity, St. Peter's chair, and succession from it, motives to keep him in the Catholic Church, must not hold him against demonstration of truth;[78] which if it be so clearly demonstrated that it cannot come into doubt, it is to be preferred before all those things by which a man is held in the Catholic Church."[79] Therefore, "an evident scripture, or demonstration of truth," must take place everywhere; but where these cannot be had, there must be submission to authority.

3. And doth not Bellarmine himself grant this? For, speaking of Councils, he delivers this proposition: "That inferiors may not judge whether their superiors" (and that in a Council) "do proceed lawfully, or not." But then, having bethought himself, that inferiors at all times and in all causes are not to be cast off, he adds this exception, "unless it manifestly appear that an intolerable error be committed."[80] So then if such an error be, and be manifest, inferiors may do their duty, and a Council must

for so holy a mind and a mind so completely at peace to agree with one who speaks truth and demonstrates it. —*Ibid.* F. Migne, ix. 129.]

[78] [In catholica enim Ecclesia . . . multa sunt alia quæ in ejus gremio me justissime teneant. Tenet consensio populorum atque gentium: tenet auctoritas miraculis inchoata, spe nutrita, caritate aucta, vetustate firmata: tenet ab ipsa sede Petri apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad præsentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum: tenet postremo ipsum Catholicæ nomen, quod non sine causa inter tam multas hæreses sic ista ecclesia sola obtenuit. For the Catholic Church has many things which hold me most rightly within its lap. I am held by the consent of peoples and nations; I am held by its authority begun in miracles, nourished in hope, growing in charity, confirmed by antiquity; I am held by the succession of the bishops up to the present bishop, received from the very chair of St. Peter the Apostle, who was entrusted by the Lord with the feeding of His sheep; lastly I am held by the very name of Catholic, which the Church alone has kept, not without good reason, among the numerous heresies, etc., etc. — S. Augustin.] *contra* [*Epistolam Manichæi, quam vocant*] *Fundamenti*, cap. iv. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 153. B.]

[79] [Apud vos autem, ubi nihil horum est quod me invitet ac teneat, sola personat veritatis pollicitatio:] quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur, ut in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus, quibus in Catholica teneor . . . [Quod] si in Evangelio aliquid apertissimum [de Manichæi apostolatu invenire potueris, infirmabis mihi Catholicorum auctoritatem, etc. But among you, who have none of those things which invite me and hold me there sounds only a promise of what is truth: which indeed if it were so plainly shown that there could be no doubt about it, ought to be preferred to all those things which hold me in the Catholic Church. . . . But if you were able to find something in the Gospel most plainly showing the Apostolic office of Manichæus, then you would weaken in my mind the authority of the Catholics.—S. Augustin.] *ibid.* capp. iv. [v. col. 153. D. 154. C.]

[80] Nisi manifestissime constet intolerabilem errorem committi. [Unless it is most clearly proved that an intolerable error has been committed.]—Bellarmin. *de Concil* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 8. § 8. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 64. B.]

[CHAPTER X.]

yield, unless you will accuse Bellarmine, too, of leaning to a private spirit; for neither doth he express who shall judge whether the "error be intolerable."

4. This will not down with you, but the definition of a General Council is and must be "infallible." Your fellows tell us, and you can affirm no more, "That the voice of the Church determining in Council is not human, but divine."[81] That is well; "divine," then sure "infallible": yea, but the proposition sticks in the throat of them that would utter it. It is not divine simply, but "in a manner[82] divine." Why, but then, sure, not "infallible," because it may speak loudest in that manner in which it is not divine. Nay more: "The Church, forsooth, is an infallible foundation of faith, in a higher kind than the Scripture: for the Scripture is but a foundation in testimony, and matter to be believed; but the Church as the efficient cause of faith, and in some sort the very formal."[83] Is not this blasphemy? Doth not this knock against all evidence of truth, and his own grounds that says it? Against all evidence of truth: for in all ages, all men that once admitted the Scripture to be the word of God, as all Christians do, do with the same breath grant it most undoubted and infallible. But all men have not so judged of the Church's definitions, though they have in greatest obedience submitted to them. And against his own grounds that says it: for the Scripture is absolutely, and every way, divine; the Church's definition is but *suo modo*, "in a sort

[81] [Vox et determinatio Ecclesiæ est suo modo divina. The voice and decision of the Church partakes of the divine.]—Stapleton. *Relect.* [*Controv.*] Controv. iv. [de potestat. Ecclesiæ in se,] Q[uæst.] 3. A[rtic]. 1. [in tit. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 750. C. *ubi sup.* p. 41. note 31.]

[82] suo modo divina.—[Stapleton.] *Ibid.* And so A. C. too, who hath opened his mouth very wide to prove the succession of pastors in the Church to be of divine and infallible authority, yet in the close is forced to add, "at least in some sort," p. 51.

[83] [Scripturam autem fundamentum et columnam fidei fatemur in suo genere esse, scilicet in genere testimoniorum, et in materia credendorum: quo sensu unus primarius articulus est fundamentum multorum, ut de Petri confessione et fide incarnati Filii Dei scripsit Hilarius *de Trinit.* lib. vi.: sed non est solum fundamentum. Ecclesia enim fundamentum et columna alia est, (*1 Tim.* iii. 15.)] in altiori genere, videlicet, in genere causæ efficientis, atque adeo aliqua ex parte formalis. [But we admit that the Scripture is the foundation and pillar of the faith in its own way, that is in the way of evidence, and in the matter of what is to be believed: in which sense one primary article is the foundation of many, as Hilary wrote about the confession and faith of Peter towards the incarnate Son of God, in his *De Trin.* lib. vi., but it is not the only foundation. For the Church is another foundation or pillar (1 *Tim.* iii. 15) in a higher way, that is in the way of being an effective cause, and therefore in some degree formal.] —[Stapleton.] *ibid.* Q[uæst.] 1. A[rtic.] 3. [in fin. Respons. ad Arg. 13. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 744. B.]

or manner," divine. But that which is but in a sort, can never be a foundation in a higher degree than that which is absolute and every way such: therefore neither can the definition of the Church be so infallible as the Scripture, much less *in altiori genere*, "in a higher kind," than the Scripture. But because, when all other things fail, you fly to this, That the Church's definition in a General Council is by inspiration, and so divine and infallible, my haste shall not carry me from a little consideration of that too. Section XXXIII.

1. Sixthly, then, if the definition of a General Council be infallible, then the infallibility of it is either in the conclusion, and in the means that prove it; or in the conclusion, not the means; or in the means, not the conclusion. But it is infallible in none of these. Not in the first—the conclusion and the means: for there are divers deliberations in General Councils, where the conclusion is catholic, but the means by which they prove it not infallible. Not in the second—the conclusion and not the means: for the conclusion must follow the nature of the premises or principles out of which it is deduced; therefore if those which the Council uses be sometimes uncertain, as is proved before, the conclusion cannot be infallible. Not in the third—the means and not the conclusion: for that cannot but be true and necessary, if the means be so. And this I am sure you will never grant; because if you should, you must deny the infallibility which you seek to establish. Consid. VI.

2. To this—for I confess the argument is old, but can never be worn out, nor shifted off—your great master,[84] Stapleton, who is miserably hampered in it,—and indeed so are you all—answers, that the infallibility of a Council is in the second course, that is, "it is infallible in the conclusion, though it be uncertain and fallible in the means and proof of it."[85] How comes this to pass? It is a thing altogether unknown in nature and art too, that fallible principles can, either father or mother, beget or bring forth an infallible conclusion.

[84] Responde, Ecclesiæ infallibilitatem secundo modo fieri, nempe circa conclusiones tantum, et non semper circa media, etc.—Stapleton. *Relect.* [*Controv.*] Controv. iv. Q[uæst.] 2. [Respons.] ad Arg. 11. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 750. A.]

[85] And herein I must needs commend your wisdom. For you have had many popes so ignorant, grossly ignorant, as that they have been no way able to sift and examine the means. And therefore you do most advisedly make them infallible in the conclusion without the means. [*Vide infra*,] Sect. xxxix. No. 8.

[CHAPTER X.]

3. Well, that is granted in nature, and in all argumentation, that causes knowledge; but we shall have reasons for it: "First, because the Church is discursive, and uses the weights and moments of reason in the means; but is prophetical, and depends upon immediate revelation from the Spirit of God in delivering the conclusion."[86] It is but the making of this appear, and all controversy is at an end. Well, I will not discourse here, To what end there is any use of means, if the conclusion be prophetical, which yet is justly urged; for no good cause can be assigned of it. If it be prophetical in the conclusion—I speak still of the present Church; for that which included the Apostles, which had the spirit of prophecy and immediate revelation, was ever prophetic in the definition, but then that was infallible in the means too—then, since it delivers the conclusion not according to nature and art, that is, out of principles which can bear it, there must be some supernatural authority which must deliver this truth: that, say I, must be the Scripture. For if you fly to immediate revelation now, the enthusiasm must be yours. But the Scriptures, which are brought in the very exposition of all the primitive Church, neither say it nor enforce it. Therefore Scripture warrants not your prophecy in the conclusion; and I know no other thing that can warrant it. If you think the tradition of the Church can, make the world beholding to you. Produce any Father of the Church that says, This is an universal tradition of the Church, That her definitions in a General Council are prophetical, and by immediate revelation. Produce any one Father that says it of his own authority, that he thinks so. Nay, make it appear that ever any prophet, in that which he delivered from God as infallible truth, was ever discursive at all in the means. Nay, make it but probable in the ordinary course of prophecy—and I hope you go no higher, nor will I offer at God's

[86] [Quarto notabimus, quod Ecclesia nihilominus in conclusione fidei semper est certissima et infallibilis. Ratio est, quia ejus doctrina nec simpliciter est prophetica . . . nec simpliciter discursiva, et solis vel rationum momentis vel humanis documentis utitur, quia ex Deo loquitur . . . sed ejus doctrina est in mediis discursiva . . . in ipsa autem conclusione est prophetica et divina . . . Est igitur in ipsa doctrina infallibilis, etsi in forma et ratione docendi non ita. We shall mark in the fourth place that the Church is no less most sure and infallible always in the conclusion of faith. The reason is, because her doctrine is neither simply prophetic . . . nor simply discursive, and uses only either "weights and moments" of reasons, or human documents . . . but her teaching is in the means discursive . . . but in the actual conclusion it is prophetic and divine. It is therefore in its teaching infallible, though not so in form and manner of instruction.—Stapleton.] *ibid.* Q[uæst.] 2. Not[abile] 4. [p. 747. C.]

absolute power—that that which is discursive in the means can be prophetic in the conclusion, and you shall be my great Apollo for ever.[87] In the mean time I have learned this from yours, "That all prophecy is by vision, inspiration," etc.;[88] and that no vision admits discourse; that all prophecy is an illumination, not always present, but when "the word of the Lord came to them;[89] and that was not by discourse. And yet you say again, "That this prophetic infallibility of the Church is not gotten without study and industry."[90] You should do well to tell us too why God would put His Church to study for the spirit of prophecy, which never any particular prophet was put unto. And whosoever shall study for it shall do it in vain, since prophecy is a gift,[91] and can never be an acquired habit. And there is somewhat in it, that Bellarmine, in all his dispute for the authority of General Councils, dares not come at this rock. He prefers the conclusion and the canon before the acts and deliberations of Councils,[92] and so do we; but I do not remember that ever he speaks out, That the conclusion is delivered by prophecy or revelation. Sure, he sounded the shore, and found danger here. He did sound it: for a little before, he speaks plainly—would his bad cause let him be constant,—"Councils do deduce their conclusions"[93]—What,

SECTION XXXIII.

1 Cor. xii 10.

[87] [Dic quibus in terris, et eris mihi magnus Apollo, etc.
Virg. *Bucol.* iii. 104.]

[88] A Deo interius inspirante: prophetæ audiebant, [secundum illud *Ps.* lxxxiv. Audiam quid loquatur in me Dominus Deus. By God inspiring us within; the prophets heard Him according to the text *Ps.* lxxxiv., I will hear what the Lord God will say in me (Vulgate).]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] v. A[rtic]. 1. [Respons.]ad. 3. [Migne, iii. 61.]

[89] "The word of the Lord came unto me," is common in the Prophets.

[90] Stapleton. *Relect.* [*Controv.*] Controv. iv. Quæst. 2. p. 473. [Respon. ad Arg. 10. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 949. D.]

[91] Propheticam revelationem nullo pacto haberi posse, vel ope naturæ, vel studio, contra Avicennam, Algazalem, Averroem, [Rabbi Mosen Ægyptium, Narbonensem, et alios. Prophetic revelation cannot be had by any bargain or by help of nature or by study, in spite of Avicenna, Algazal, Averroes, Rabbi Moses of Egypt, Narbonensis, and others.—Joan.] Fran. Picus [Mirandula, *de Rerum*] *prænot*[*ione*, lib.] ii. cap. 4. [in tit. apud *Op.*, Joann. Pic. Mirandulæ, tom. ii. p. 281. ed. Basil. 1496.]

[92] [Credimus enim nullum esse verbum in Scriptura frustra, aut non recte positum, at in conciliis maxima pars actorum ad fidem non pertinet. For we believe that no word in Scripture is in vain, or not rightly placed, but in councils a very great part of the things done does not belong to the faith. —Bellarmin.] *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 12. [§ 7. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 87. B.]

[93] [At] Concilia non habent, neque scribunt immediatas revelationes, [aut verba Dei,] sed [tantum declarant, quodnam sit] verbum Dei [scriptum, vel traditum, et quomodo intelligi debeat, et præterea] ex eo per ratiocinationem deducunt conclusiones. [Councils do not have and do not write revelations direct from God, but only declare what is the Word of God written or traditional, and how it

[CHAPTER X.]

from inspiration? No: but—"out of the word of God, and that *per ratiocinationem*, 'by argumentation.'" Neither have they, nor do they write, any immediate revelations.

4. The second reason why Stapleton will have it prophetic in the conclusion, is, "Because that which is determined by the Church is matter of faith, not of knowledge: and that therefore the Church proposing it to be believed, though it use means, yet it stands not upon art, or means, or argument, but the revelation of the Holy Ghost: else, when we embrace the conclusion proposed, it should not be an assent of faith, but a habit of knowledge."[94] This, for the first part—That the Church uses the means, but follows them not—is all one in substance with the former reason. And for the later part, That then our admitting the decree of a Council would be no "assent of faith," but an "habit of knowledge," what great inconvenience is there, if it be granted? For I think it is undoubted truth, that one and the same conclusion may be faith to the believer that cannot prove, and knowledge to the learned that can. And St. Augustine, I am sure, in regard of one and the same thing, even this, the very wisdom of the Church in her doctrine, ascribes "understanding" to one sort of men, and "belief" to another weaker sort.[95] And Thomas[96] goes with him.

5. Now, for further satisfaction, if not of you, yet of others, this may well be thought on. Man lost by sin the integrity of his nature, and cannot have light enough to see the way to heaven but by grace. This grace was first merited, after given, by Christ: this grace is first kindled in[1] faith, by which, if we agree not to some supernatural principles, which no reason can demonstrate simply, we can never see our way. But this light, when it hath made reason submit itself, clears the eye of reason;

[1] [by.... Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

ought to be understood, and further draw conclusions from it by reasoning.] —Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 12. § 3. [*Op.*, tom, ii. col. 86. C.]

[94] Stapleton. *ibid.* p. 374. [id est, *Relect. Controv.* Controv. iv. Quæst. 2. Respons. ad Arg. 11. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 750. A.]

[95] Ceteram turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit. [The rest of the crowd are made safest not by cleverness in understanding, but by simple faith in believing.—S. Augustin.] *contra* [*Epistolam Manichæi dictam*] *Fundamenti*, cap. iv. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 153 A.]

[96] Nihil [tamen] prohibet illud, quod secundum se demonstrabile est, et scibile, ab aliquo accipi, ut credibile, qui demonstrationem non capit. [Nothing, however, hinders that point which is demonstrable in itself and capable of being known, from being received as credible by a man who does not understand the demonstration.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 1. Q[uæst.] ii. A[rtic.] 2. ad primum. [Migne, i. 473.]

it never puts it out. In which sense, it may be, is that of Optatus, "That the very Catholic Church itself is reasonable, as well as diffused everywhere."[97] By which "reason enlightened,"[98] which is stronger than reason, the Church in all ages hath been able either to convert or convince, or at least "stop the mouths" of philosophers and the great men of reason, in the very point of faith where it is at highest.[99] To the present occasion, then. The first, immediate, fundamental points of faith, without which there is no salvation, as they cannot be proved by reason, so neither need they be determined by any Council; nor ever were they attempted, they are so plain set down in the Scripture. If about the sense and true meaning of these, or necessary deduction out of these prime articles of faith, General Councils determine any thing, as they have done in Nice and the rest, there is no inconvenience that one and the same canon of the Council should be believed, as it reflects upon the articles and grounds indemonstrable, and yet known to the learned by the means and proof by which that deduction is vouched and made good.[100] And again, the conclusion of a Council—suppose that in Nice about the consubstantiality of Christ with the Father—in itself considered, is indemonstrable by reason: there I believe and assent in faith: but the same conclusion, if you give me the ground of Scripture and the Creed (and somewhat must be supposed in all, whether faith or knowledge) is demonstrable by natural reason, against any Arian in the world.[101] And if it be

[97] Rationabilis et ubique diffusa. [Reasonable and everywhere diffused.]—S. Optat. Milevitan. *de Schism. Donatist.* lib. ii. cap. 1. *Op.*, 26. St. Optatus is illustrating the name Catholic from the two derivations which had been given of it; one as though it were from *κατὰ λόγον*, *secundum rationem*—the other from *καθ' ὅλον*, *secundum totum.*]

[98] Ut ipsa fide valentiores facti, quod credimus intelligere mereamur, non jam hominibus, sed [Ipso] Deo intrinsecus mentem nostram illuminante et firmante. [In order that, having been made stronger by faith, we may deserve to understand what we believe, having our minds illuminated and strengthened no longer by men, but by God Himself within us.]—S. Augustin. *cont. Epist. Fundamenti* [*ut sup.*] cap. 14. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 160. E.]

[99] Omnia ingeniorum genera subdita. [All kinds of characters have been subdued.]—S. Augustin. *cont. Faust.* lib. xxii. cap. 96. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 420. F.]

[100] Almain [in] III. [*Sentent.*] D[istinct. xxiv. Q[uæst.] unica. [The argument in the text is rather implied than expressed in Almain.—Et, id quod est scitum, ab uno homine etiam in statu viæ, sit ab alio creditum, qui hoc demonstrative non novit. [That which is known by one man on this earthly pilgrimage is believed by another, who does not know it, as a matter of proof.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] i. A[rtic.] 5. [in] C[onclus. Migne, iii. 16.]

[101] [Et cum] Nicænum concilium [definivit, Christum esse homoousion Patri,] deduxit conclusionem ex Scripturis: [in quibis diserte continetur

[CHAPTER X.] demonstrable, I may know it, and have a habit of it. And what inconvenience in this? For the weaker sort of Christians, which cannot deduce, when they have the principle granted, they are to rest upon the definition only, and their assent is mere faith: yea, and the learned too, where there is not a demonstration evident to them, assent by faith only, and not by knowledge. And what inconvenience in this? Nay, the necessity of nature is such, that, these principles once given, the understanding of man cannot rest but it must be thus. And the Apostle would never [1] Pet. iii. 15 have required "a man to be able to give a reason and an account of the hope that is in him," if he might not be able to know his account, or have lawful interest to give it when he knew it, without prejudicing his faith by his knowledge. And suppose exact knowledge and mere belief cannot stand together in the same person, in regard of the same thing, by the same means, yet that doth not make void this truth. For where is that exact knowledge, or in whom, that must not merely, in points of faith, believe the article or ground upon which they rest? But when that is once believed, it can demonstrate many things from it. And definitions of Councils are not *principia fidei*, "principles of faith," but deductions from them.

Consid. VII. 1. And now because you ask, "Wherein are we nearer to unity by a Council, if a Council may err?"—besides the answer given, I promised to consider which opinion was most agreeable with the Church, which most able to preserve or reduce Christian peace: the Roman, That a Council cannot err; or the Protestants', That it can. And this I propose not as a rule, but leave the Christian world to consider of it, as I do.

2. First, then, I consider, Whether in those places of Scripture before mentioned, or any other, there be promised to the present Church an absolute infallibility? or whether such an infallibility will not serve the turn as Stapleton, after much wriggling, is forced to acknowledge? "one not every way exact: because it is enough, if the Church do diligently insist upon that which was once received. And there is not need of so great certainty to open and explicate that which lies hid in the seed of faith sown,

unum esse Deum, et Patrem esse Deum, ac Filium esse Deum. And when the Nicene Council defined that Christ was of the same nature as the Father, they deduced a conclusion from the Scriptures, in which it is plainly contained that God is one, and that the Father is God and the Son is God.]—Bellarmin. *de Concil[iorum auctoritat.]* lib. ii. cap. 12. § 4. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 86. D.]

and deduce from it, as to seek out and teach that which was altogether unknown."[102] And if this be so, then, sure, the Church of the Apostles required guidance by a greater degree of infallibility than the present Church; which yet, if it follow the Scripture, is infallible enough, though it hath not the same degree of certainty which the Apostles had and the Scripture hath. Nor can I tell what to make of Bellarmine, that in a whole chapter disputes five prerogatives, in certainty of truth, "that the Scripture hath above a Council";[103] and at last concludes, "That they may be said to be equally certain in infallible truth."

3. The next thing I consider is, Suppose this "not exact" but congruous infallibility in the Church, is it not residing, according to power and right of authority, in the whole Church, [always[1] understanding the Church in this place *pro communitate prælatorum*, for Church governors which have votes in councils,] and in a General Council only by power deputed, with mandate to determine?[104] The places of Scripture, with expositions of the Fathers upon them, make me apt to believe this. "St. Peter," saith St. Augustine, "did not receive the keys of the Church, but as sustaining the person of the Church."[105] Now for this particular, suppose the key of doctrine be to let in truth and shut out error; and suppose the key rightly used, "infallible" in this: yet this infallibility is primely in the Church [docent,[2]] in whose person, not strictly in his own, St. Peter received the keys. But here Stapleton lies cross my way again, and would thrust me out of this consideration. He grants that St. Peter received these keys, indeed, and in the person of the Church; "but," saith he,

[1] [Added in Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

[2] [Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

[102] Exacta et omnimoda infallibilitate non indiget; sed satis est semel acceptis [diligenter insistere: neque tanta certitudine opus est aperire et explicare quod virtute in semine fidei latet, aliudque ex alio deducere, quam de novo rem penitus ignoratam explorare et docere.—Stapleton.] *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] iv. Q[uæst.] 2. Notab[ile] 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 747. C.]

[103] Cum [enim] utraque sint infallibilis veritatis, æque certa dici possunt. —[Bellarmin.] *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 12. § ult. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 88. C.]

[104] Quod si Ecclesiæ universitati non est data ulla auctoritas, ergo neque Concilio Generali, quatenus Ecclesiam universalem repræsentat. [But if no authority is given to the whole body of the Church, therefore it is not given to a General Council, in so far as it is representative of the Church.]—Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 16. § 4.

[105] Ecclesiæ Catholicæ personam sustinet Petrus: huic enim [Ecclesiæ] claves [regni cœlorum] datæ sunt, cum Petro datæ [sunt. Peter fills the part of the Catholic Church; for to her, the Church, the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given, when they were given to Peter.—S. Augustin.] *de Agone Christiano*, cap. xxx. [*Op.*, tom. vi. col. 260. C.]

[CHAPTER X.]

"that was because he was primate of the Church; and, therefore, the Church received the keys finally, but St. Peter formally"[106]—that is, if I mistake him not, St. Peter, for himself and his successors, received the keys in his own right; but to this end—to benefit the Church, of which he was made pastor. But I keep in my consideration still; [for[1] the Church here is taken *pro communitate prælatorum*, "for all the prelates," that is, for the Church as it is docent and regent, as it teaches and governs: for so only it relates to a General Council; and so St. Augustine[107] and Stapleton himself understand it in the places before alleged. Now in this sense St. Peter received the keys formally for himself and his successors at Rome, but not for them only; but as he received them in the person of the whole Church docent, so he received them also in their right as well as his own, and for them all. And in this sense St. Peter received the keys in the person of the Church (by Stapleton's good leave) both finally and formally]. And[2] I would have this considered, Whether it be ever read in any classic author, That to receive a thing in the person of another, or sustaining the person of another, is only meant finally to receive it, that is, to his good, and not in his right. I should think he that receives any thing in the person of another, receives it indeed to his good, and to his use, but in his right too; and that[3] the primary and formal right is not in the receiver, but in him whose person he sustains while he receives it.

[1] [Added Editt. 1673, and 1686].

[2] [For I would have it considered also, . . Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

[3] [the formal right is not in the receiver only, but in him, or them also, whose person . . . Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

[106] [Ad confirmationem responde: quod Petrus accepit a Christo claves in persona ecclesiæ,] sed propter primatum quem gerebat Ecclesiæ, ideoque etsi finaliter Ecclesia [illas] accepit, tamen formaliter Petrus accepit. [Answer in confirmation: that Peter received from Christ the keys, filling the part of the Church, but he did this because of the primacy of the Church which he held, and therefore although finally the Church received them, yet Peter formally received them.]—[Stapleton.] *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. [de med. jud. Eccl. in causa fidei,] Q[uæst.] 3. Artic. v. [*in fine. Op.*, tom. i. p. 828. A.]

[107] [Et cum ei dicitur] ad omnes dicitur, [Amas Me?] Pasce oves, etc. [And when it is said to him, it is said for all: Lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep.]—S. Augustin. *de Agone Christiano.* cap. xxx. [*ut sup.* note 105.] Which cannot be spoken or meant of the laity.—And, ["Therefore when Augustine sayeth, *Si hoc Petro tantum dictum est*, etc. (*ubi sup.* p. 215. note 107.) we must not think by the name of the Church he intendeth the lay presbytery or the people, but he doth attribute this power to the Church, because the Apostles and their successors, the pastors and governors of the Church, received the keys in Peter and with Peter."]—Bilson, *Perpetual Government* [*of Christ's Church*,] chap. viii. *in fin.* [p. 104. ed. London, 1610.]

[EDIT. 1639.]

A man purchases land, and takes possession of it by an attorney. I hope the attorney,[108] being the hand to receive it instrumentally, and no more, shall take nor use nor right from the purchaser. A man marries a wife by a proxy[110] (this is not unusual among great persons), but I hope he that hath the proxy, and receives the woman with the ceremonies of marriage in the other's name, must also leave her to be the other's wife, who gave him power to receive her for him.

[EDITT. 1673, AND 1686.]

[I will take one of Stapleton's[109] own instances. A consul or prime senator in an aristocratical government (such as the Church's is ministerially under Christ) receives a privilege from the senate; and he receives it as primarily and as formally for them as for himself, and in the senate's right as well as his own, he being but a chief part, and they the whole. And this is St. Peter's case in relation to the whole Church docent and regent, saving that his place and power was perpetual, and not annual, as the consul's was.]

SECTION XXXIII.

This stumbling-block, then, is nothing: and in my consideration it stands still, That the Church in general, by the hands of the Apostles and their successors, received the keys, and all power signified by them, and [[1]transmitted them to their successors, who] by the assistance of God's Spirit may be able to use them, but still in and by the same hands—and perhaps to open and shut in some things infallibly—when the Pope, and a General Council

[1] [Added in Editt. 1673, and 1686.

[108] Nec idem est possidere, et alieno nomine possidere. Nam possidet, cujus nomine possidetur. Procurator alienæ possessioni præstat ministerium. [To possess a thing is not the same as to possess it in another's name; for the man in whose name a thing is possessed is its real possessor. The steward devotes his service to another man's possession.]—[*Digest.* lib. xli. tit. ii.] de adquir. [vel amittend.] possess. cap. *Quod meo*, 18. Celsus, in princip.

[109] [Accepit ergo Ecclesia, id est, tota communitas prælatorum ecclesiæ, in persona Petri, tanquam in persona capitis, ut respublica in persona principis, vel magistratus supremi. Therefore the Church received the keys, that is the whole body of the prelates of the Church received them in the person of Peter, as in the person of their head, as a state does in the person of its chief or its supreme magistrate, etc.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] iii. [de prim. subjecto potestat. Eccles.] Q[uæst.] i. Artic. 1. [Resp.] ad Arg. 2. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 672. C.]

[110] Quando matrimonium fit per procuratorem, procurator autem est conditio sine qua non. [When a marriage is made by a proxy, still the proxy is a necessary condition of it.]—Sanchez, *de* [*sancto*] *matrim*[*onii Sacramento*,] lib. ii. Disput. xi. Q[uæst.] 4. No. 28. p. 128. [col. 2. ed. Antverp. 1626.]

[CHAPTER X.]

too, forgetting both her and her rule, the Scripture, are to seek how to turn these keys in their wards.

4. The third particular I consider is: Suppose, in the whole Catholic Church militant, an "absolute infallibility in the prime foundations of faith absolutely necessary to salvation"; and that this power of not erring so is not communicable to a General Council[111] which represents it, but that the council is subject to error. This supposition doth not only preserve that which you desire in the Church, an infallibility, but it meets with all inconveniences which usually have done, and daily do, perplex the Church.[112] And here is still a remedy for all things: For if private respects, if bandies in a faction,[113] if power and favour of some parties, if weakness of them which have the managing, if any unfit mixture of State Councils, if any departure from the rule of the Word of God, if any thing else, sway and wrench the council,—the whole Church,[114] upon evidence found in express

[111] Non omnia illa quæ tradit Ecclesia sub definitione judiciali (*i.e.* in Concilio) sunt de necessitate salutis credenda, sed illa duntaxat quæ sic tradit concurrente universali totius Ecclesiæ consensu, *implicite*, vel *explicite*, *vere*, vel *interpretative*. [Not everything which the Church hands down as judicially defined, *i.e.* in a Council, is necessary to be believed for salvation, but those merely which it so hands down with the consent and agreement of the whole universal Church, given implicitly, or explicitly, actually or by interpretation.]—Gerson. *Tract. in Declaratione Veritatum, quæ credendæ sunt*, etc. *Op.*, par. i. § 4. p. 414. [ed. 1606. et, tom. i. col. 22. C. ed. Dupin. *ubi sup.* p. 223. note 4.]

[112] Possit tamen contingere quod quamvis generale concilium definiret aliquid contra fidem, Ecclesia Dei non exponeretur periculo: quia posset contingere, quod congregati in Concilio Generali essent pauci et viles, tam in re, quam in hominum reputatione, respectu illorum, qui ad illud Concilium Generale minime convenissent. Et tunc illorum leviter error extirparetur per multitudinem meliorum et sapientiorum et famosiorum illis, quibus etiam multitudo simplicium adhæreret magis. [It may, however, happen that although a General Council should define something against the faith, still the Church of God would not be exposed to danger; for it might happen that the men assembled at the General Council were few and contemptible both actually and in the opinion of mankind in comparison with those who did not come to the General Council. And then their error would be easier to pluck up, because of the number of fitter and wiser and more famous men, to whom also the crowd of ignorant persons would adhere rather than to the members of the council.]—Ockam. *Dial.* par 3. lib. iii. cap. 13. [apud Goldast. *Monarch. S. Rom. Imper.* tom. ii. p. 829.]

[113] Many of these were potent at Ariminum and Seleucia.

[114] Determinationibus quæ a concilio, vel pontifice summo fiant super eis dubitationibus, quæ substantiam fidei concernunt, [quoad] dum universalis Ecclesia non reclamaret, necessario credendum est. [The decisions which are made on those disputed points which concern the ground of the faith by the council or by the supreme pontiff must necessarily be believed, so long as the whole Church does not cry out against them.]—Fran. Picus Mirandula, [*de fide et ordine credendi*,] Theorema viii. [in tit. apud *Op.*, Joann. Pic. Mirandulæ, tom. ii. p. 185.]

Scripture, or demonstration, of this miscarriage, hath power to represent herself in another body or council, and to take order for what was amiss, either practised or concluded. So here is a means, without any infringing any lawful authority of the Church, to preserve or reduce unity; and yet grant, as I did, and as the Church of England doth,[115] "That a General Council may err." And this course the Church heretofore took; for she did call and represent herself in a new council, and define against the heretical conclusions of the former; as in the case at Ariminum, and the second of Ephesus, is evident; and in other councils named by Bellarmine.[116] Now, the Church is never more cunningly abused, than when men, out of this truth, That she may err, infer this falsehood, That she is not to be obeyed. For it will never follow: She may err,—Therefore, She may not govern. For he that says, "Obey them which have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls," commands obedience, and expressly ascribes rule to the Church. And this is not only a pastoral power, to teach and direct, but a prætorian also, to control and censure too, where errors or crimes are against points fundamental or of great consequence. Else St. Paul would not have given the rule for excommunication; nor Christ Himself have put the man that will not hear and obey the Church, into the place and condition of an ethnic and a publican, as He doth. And Solomon's rule is general, and he hath it twice: "My son, forsake not the teaching or instruction of thy mother." Now this is either spoken and meant of a natural mother—and "her authority over her children is confirmed"; and "the fool" will be upon him "that despiseth her"[117]—or it is extended to our mystical and spiritual mother, the Church. And so the Geneva note[118] upon the place expresses it. And I cannot but incline to

SECTION XXXIII.

Heb. xiii. 17.

1 Cor. v. 5.

Matt. xviii. 17.

Prov. i. 8. Prov. vi. 20.

Ecclus. iii. 2.

Prov. xv. 20.

[115] Artic. XXI.

[116] Tertio: Concilium sine papa [potest errare, etiam in fidei decretis, ut patet in Concilio Smyrnensi, cui subscripsit Hosius: item Mediolanensi, Ariminensi, Ephesino II., Constantinopolitano, sub Justiniano II., Constantinopolitano, sub Leone Isauro, et alio, sub Constantino Copronymo. Thirdly, a council without the pope can err even in decrees of faith, as is evident in the case of the Council of Smyrna, to which Hosius subscribed; also those of Milan, Arimini, Ephesus II., Constantinople under Justinian II., Constantinople under Leo the Isaurian, and another under Constantine Copronymus.] — Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 16. § 6. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 94. D.]

[117] *Vide* S. Augustin. *Confess.* lib. ii. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 83. In this chapter, St. Augustine speaks of the early care and watchfulness which his mother, Monica, exerted over him.]

[118] "'Forsake not thy mother's instruction,' that is, the teaching of the Church, wherein the faithful are

[CHAPTER X.]

this opinion; because the blessings which accompany this obedience are so many and great, as that they are not like to be the fruits of obedience to a natural mother only, as Solomon expresses them all. And in all this, here is no exception of the mother's erring; for *mater errans*, "an erring mother," loses neither the right nor the power of a mother by her error. And I marvel what son should show reverence or obedience, if no mother that had erred might exact it. It is true, the son is not to follow his mother's error, or his mother into error; but it is true too, it is a grievous crime in a son to cast off all obedience to his mother, because at some time or in some things she hath fallen into error. And, howsoever, this consideration meets with this inconvenience, as well as the rest; for suppose, as I said, in the whole Catholic militant Church, an absolute infallibility in the prime foundations of faith absolutely necessary to salvation;—and then, though the mother Church, provincial or national, may err, yet, if the grandmother, the whole Universal Church, cannot in these necessary things, all remains safe, and all occasions of disobedience, taken from the possibility of the Church's erring, are quite taken away. Nor is this mother less to be valued by her children, because in some smaller things age had filled her face fuller of wrinkles. For where it is said, that "Christ makes to Himself a Church without spot or wrinkle," that is not understood of the Church militant, but of the Church triumphant. And to maintain the contrary, is a branch of the spreading heresy of Pelagianism.[119] Nor is the Church on earth any freer from wrinkles in doctrine and discipline, than she is from spots in life and conversation.

Prov. vi. [20-23.] Prov. vi. 22.

Eph. v. 27.

5. The next thing I consider is: Suppose a General Council infallible in all things which are of faith: if it prove not so but that an error in the faith be concluded, the same erring opinion that makes it think itself infallible, makes the error of it seem irrevocable. And when truth which lay hid shall be brought to light, the Church, who was lulled asleep by the opinion of

begotten by the incorruptible seed of God's word."—Annot. in *Prov.* i. 8.

[119] In id [etiam] progrediuntur (Pelagiani) ut dicant vitam justorum in hoc sæculo nullum omnino habere peccatum, et ex his ecclesiam Christi in hac mortalitate perfici, ut sit omnino sine macula et ruga, quasi non sit Christi Ecclesia, quæ in toto terrarum orbe clamat ad Deum: Dimitte nobis debita nostra, etc. [To it also come the Pelagians, in order to say that the life of the just in this world is entirely free from sin, and that the Church of Christ is formed of men of this kind in this mortal life, so as to be without spot or wrinkle, as if it were not the Church of Christ which, through the whole world, calls to God, "Forgive us our debts."]—S. Augustin. *Lib. de Hæresibus*, Hær. lxxxviii. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 26. D.]

infallibility, is left open to all manner of distractions, as it appears at this day. And that a Council may err—besides all other instances, which are not a few—appears by that error of the Council of Constance.[120] And one instance is enough to overthrow a general, be it a Council. Christ instituted the sacrament of His body and blood in both kinds. To break Christ's institution is a damnable error, and so confessed by Stapleton.[121] The council is bold, and defines peremptorily, That to "communicate in both kinds is not necessary; with a *non obstante* to the institution of Christ." Consider now with me, Is this an error, or not? Bellarmine and Stapleton,[122] and you too, say it is not; because to receive under both kinds is not by Divine right. No! —No, sure; for it was not Christ's precept, but His example.[123] Why, but I had thought, Christ's institution of a sacrament had been more than His example only; and as binding for the necessaries of a sacrament, the matter and form, as a precept.[124] Therefore speak out, and deny it to be Christ's institution; or else grant with Stapleton, "It is a damnable error to go against it." If you can prove that Christ's institution is not as binding to

SECTION XXXIII.

Matt. xxvi. [27.] 1 Cor xi. [23, 25.]

[120] Sess. xiii. [*Vide infra.* p. 302, note 126.]

[121] [Nos quidem tenemus . . . quod ecclesia Christi in errorem aliquem damnabilem incidere non potest: qualis profecto est, institutionem Christi in aliquo sacramento administrando pervertere atque violare. [We indeed hold . . . that the Church of Christ cannot fall into any damnable error; and such a damnable error it certainly is to pervert and violate the institution of Christ in the administration of any sacrament.]—Stapleton. *Return of Untruths upon Mr. Jewell*, Art. 2. Untruth 49. [*Falsitatis nota in Juellum retorta*, Artic. ii. Falsum (sc. Hardingi, sic Juell.) 49. Mendacium (sc. Juelli, sic Stapleton.) 94. *Op.*, tom. iv. p. 1253. A.]

[122] Bellarmin. *de Eucharist.* [lib. iv.] cap. 26. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 761; in which, after arguing, Non pugnare cum divinis literis, seu cum Christi mandato, communionem sub una specie (communion under one kind is not repugnant to the holy writings or the command of Christ,) (capp. 24, 25.) he meets the objections taken from the Fathers.—And, Stapleton, *ubi sup.* note 121.]

[123] [Neque dicit (Concilium Constantiense,) servandum ecclesiæ morem, non obstante Christi præcepto, sed, non obstante Christi exemplo. Nor does the Council of Constance say that the custom of the Church is to be observed, in spite of the precept of Christ, but in spite of the actual example of Christ.]—Bellarmin. *ibid.* § 46. [col. 768. B.]

[124] And now lately in a Catechism printed at Paris, 1637, without the author's name, it is twice affirmed thus: "The institution of a sacrament is of itself a command."—Conference xiv. p. 244; and again, [Conference xiv.] p. 260. "Institution is a precept."—[*A Catechism of Christian Doctrine.* Printed at Paris, 1637. It has the approbation of the Doctors of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris; and the Preface, p. 5, states, "that the author's name alone, would he take it well to have it here mentioned, were enough to justify these words: who for profoundness of science, and consummateness in all parts of literature, both divine and human, is the honour of our times, and may be the envy of the happiest."]

[CHAPTER X.]

Matt. xxvi. [27.] 1 Cor. xi. [23-26.]

us as a precept—which you shall never be able—take the precept with it, "Drink ye all of this";[125]—which though you shift as you can, yet you can never make it other than it is, a binding precept. But Bellarmine hath yet one better device than this, to save the council. He saith, it is a mere calumny, and that the council hath no such thing: "That the *non obstante* hath no reference to receiving under both kinds, but to the time of receiving it—after supper; in which the council saith, the custom of the Church is to be observed, *non obstante*, 'notwithstanding' Christ's example." How foul Bellarmine is in this, must appear by the words of the council, which are these: "Though Christ instituted this venerable sacrament, and gave it His disciples, after supper, under both kinds of bread and wine, yet, *non obstante*, 'notwithstanding' this, it ought not to be consecrated after supper, nor received but fasting. And likewise, that though, in the primitive Church, this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds; yet this custom, that it should be received by laymen only under the kind of bread, is to be held for a law, which may not be refused. And to say this is an unlawful custom, of receiving under one kind, is erroneous; and they which persist in saying so, are to be punished and driven out as heretics."[126] Now, where is here any slander

[125] Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τῆς σωτηρίου ταύτης ἐντολῆς. [Remembering therefore this command of our Saviour.] —in *Liturg. S. Chrysostom.* [apud Goar. *Euchologion*, p. 77. et, apud *Op.*, S. Chrysostom. tom. xii. p. 791. D.]

[126] Licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum, tamen hoc *non obstante*, [sacrorum Canonum auctoritas laudabilis, et approbata consuetudo ecclesiæ servavit et servat, quod hujusmodi sacramentum] non debet confici post cœnam, neque [a fidelibus] recipi non jejunis. [Although Christ instituted it after supper, and administered this venerable Sacrament to His disciples under both kinds, both bread and wine, still in spite of this the praiseworthy authority of the holy Canons and the approved custom of the Church has kept and still keeps this rule that the Sacrament ought not to be celebrated after supper nor to be received by the faithful unless they are fasting.]—Here Bellarmine stays, and goes no farther, but the Council goes on: [nisi in casu infirmitatis, aut alterius necessitatis, a jure vel ecclesia concesso vel admisso.] Et quod licet in primitiva ecclesia [hujusmodi] sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, tamen hæc consuetudo [ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta,] quod [a conficientibus sub utraque specie, et] a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur: habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare. Quapropter dicere, illicitum, censeri debet erroneum: et pertinaciter asserentes tanquam hæretici arcendi sunt, [et graviter puniendi per diœcesanos, etc. Except in case of weakness, or of some other necessity, allowed and admitted by the law or by the Church. . . . And because, although in the primitive Church this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds, still this custom was reasonably introduced to avoid certain dangers and scandals, that the celebrants should receive under both

of the council? The words are plain, and the *non obstante* must necessarily, for aught I can yet see, be referred to both clauses in the words following, because both clauses went before it; and hath as much force against receiving under both kinds, as against receiving after supper. Yea, and the after-words of the council couple both together in this reference; for it follows, "*Et similiter*, 'and so likewise,' that though in the primitive Church," etc. And a man by the definition of this council may be an heretic, for standing to Christ's institution in the very matter of the sacrament. And the Church's law for one kind may not be refused, but Christ's institution under both kinds may; and yet this council did not err! No; take heed of it.

6. But your opinion is more unreasonable than this; for consider any body collective, be it more or less universal, whensoever it assembles itself, did it ever give more power to the representing body of it, than binding power upon all particulars, and itself? And did it ever give this power otherwise, than with this reservation in nature, That it would call again and reform, yea, and if need were, abrogate, any law or ordinance, upon just cause made evident that this representing body had failed in trust or truth? And this power, no body collective, ecclesiastical, or civil, can put out of itself, or give away to a parliament or council—or call it what you will that represents it. Nay, in my Consideration, it holds strongest in the Church; for a council hath power to order, settle, and define differences arisen concerning faith. This power the council hath not by any immediate institution from Christ, but it was prudently taken up in the Church, from the apostles' example.[127] So that to hold councils to this end, is apparent apostolical tradition written; but the power which councils so held have, is from the whole Catholic Church, whose members they are; and the Church's power from

Acts xv. [6-29.]

kinds; and the laymen should receive the bread only. . . . This must be treated as a law which may not be rejected. Wherefore to say this is unlawful ought to be considered erroneous; and those who assert it pertinaciously must be shunned as heretics, and severely punished by the Diocesans.]—Concil. Constant. III. an. 1415.] Sess. xiii. [*Concil.* tom. xii. col. 100. B—D.]

[127] In novo [vero] testamento exemplum celebrationis conciliorum ab apostolis habemus: [But in the New Testament we have an example of how the apostles held a Council.]—Johan. de Turrecremata, *Summ. de Ecclesia*, lib. iii. cap. 2.—Et firmitas conciliorum nititur exemplo primi concilii. [And the stability of councils rests on the example of the first Council.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rtic.] 4. [Respons.] ad 3. [*ubi sup.* p. 276. note 44.]

[CHAPTER X.]

God. "And this power the Church cannot farther give away" to a General Council,[128] than that the decrees of it shall bind all particulars, and itself, but not bind the whole Church, from calling again; and in the after-calls, upon just cause to order, yea, and if need be, to abrogate former acts. I say, upon just cause; for if the council be lawfully called, and proceed orderly, and conclude according to the rule, the Scripture, the whole Church cannot but approve the council, and then the definitions of it are binding. And the power of the Church hath no wrong in this, so long as no power but her own may meddle or offer to infringe any definition of hers made in her representative body, a lawful General Council. And certain it is, no power but her own may do it. Nor doth this open any gap to private spirits; for all decisions in such a council are binding; and because the whole Church can meet no other way, the council shall remain the supreme, external, living, temporary, ecclesiastical judge of all controversies; only the whole Church, and she alone, hath power, when Scripture or demonstration is found and peaceably tendered to her, to represent herself again in a new council, and in it to order what was amiss.

[128] This is more reasonable a great deal than that of Bellarmine, *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 18. [in tit.] Pontificem non posse subjicere seipsum sententiæ coactivæ conciliorum. [That the Pope cannot subject himself to the coercive decision of Councils.]—[*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 99. B.]

[CHAPTER XI.

The Pope is not infallible.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

SECTION XXIII.

Laud continues that the Jesuit does not acknowledge the infallibility, nor the authority of Councils, for he requires their decrees to be confirmed by the Pope. Now is the Pope infallible?

Consider the bad character of a number of Popes. Great Roman writers, even among the moderns, have denied the infallibility. The ancient Church held no such doctrine. Pope Liberius refers an important matter to Athanasius for decision. Popes, e.g. Innocent III. and Honorius III. have made false prophecies. Alexander III. condemned Peter Lombard as a heretic; Innocent III. restored him. It is shameful to make a mere man the Judge of Christ's words. Where is the scriptural proof of such a doctrine? For 1000 *years of Church history no one believed it.*

And a Pope can be condemned for heresy, according to (1) *the Canon Law;* (2) *Cardinal Cajetan;* (3) *and even, in some degree, Cardinal Bellarmine. And the Papal Infallibility has proved useless, for it has not preserved unity, but has divided the Church. And, you can never be sure that you have a real Pope; "the intention," according to Roman teaching, may have failed in his Ordination or Consecration. And, the Pope has certainly erred in his judicial decisions, e.g. about Transubstantiation, about Communion in one kind, about the Invocation of Saints, and about the Adoration of Images; which last two risk idolatry, as Roman writers themselves confess. Facts thus prove that the Pope is not infallible.*]

7. Nay, your opinion is yet more unreasonable: for you do not only make the definition of a General Council, but the sentence of the pope, infallible, nay, more infallible than it. For

[CHAPTER XI.]

any General Council may err with you, if the pope confirm it not.[1] So belike this infallibility rests not in the representative body, the council, nor in the whole body, the Church, but in your head of the Church, the pope of Rome. Now I may ask you, To what end such a trouble for a General Council? Or wherein are we nearer to unity, if the pope confirm it not? You answer, though not in the Conference, yet elsewhere, That the pope errs not, "especially giving sentence in a General Council." And why "especially"? Doth the deliberation of a council help any thing to the conclusion? Surely not, in your opinion; for you hold the conclusion "prophetical," the means "fallible": and fallible deliberations cannot advance to a prophetic conclusion. And just as the council is, in Stapleton's judgment, "for the definition and the proofs"; so is the pope, in the judgment of Melch[ior] Canus,[2] and them which followed him, "prophetical in the conclusion." The council, then, is called but only, in effect, to hear the pope give his sentence in more state. Else what means this of Stapleton: "The pope, by a council joined unto him, acquires no new power, or authority, or certainty in judging, no more than a head is the wiser by joining the offices of the rest of the members to it, than it is without them"?[3] Or, this of Bellarmine: "That all the firmness and infallibility of a General Council, is only from the pope, not partly from the pope and partly from the council"?[4] So, belike, the presence

[1] Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. capp. 17, 18. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 93. The substance of these two chapters is: Non esse in Concilio summam potestatem—and, Summum Pontificem absolute esse supra concilium. That the supreme power does not reside in a Council; and that the supreme Pontiff is absolutely above a Council.]

[2] Et quidem in conclusione pontifices summi errare nequeunt, [si fidei quæstionem ex apostolico tribunali decernant.] Sin vero [pontificum] rationes [necessariæ non sunt, ne dicam aptæ, probabiles, idoneæ, in his nihil est, videlicet immorandum. And indeed finally we conclude that the supreme Pontiffs cannot err, when they decide a question of faith from the apostolic seat of judgment. But if the reasons of the Pontiffs are not convincing, not to say apt, probable, fitting, this does not matter; and we need not delay over it.—Melch.] Canus, *de Locis* [*Theolog.*] lib. vi. [*de Eccles. Roman. auctoritat.*] cap. 8. § 8. [p. 401. ed. Lovan. 1569.]

[3] Augustinus illud dixit, quia ad compescendos [illos] importunos hæreticos [illud] medium generalis concilii [evidentius et] illustrius, et vulgo hominum magis satisfacit. [Augustine said this because a General Council is the more evident and brilliant means for appeasing troublesome heretics, and satisfies the common herd better.—Stapleton.] *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] vi. Q[uæst.] iii. A[rtic.] 5. [ad 4. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 827. B.]

[4] At contra: nam [imprimis Dominus soli Petro dixit: Oravi pro te, et, Pasce oves Meas, non dixit hæc Petro et concilio. Item solum Petrum vocavit petram et fundamentum, non Petrum cum concilio:] ex quo apparet totam firmitatem conciliorum legiti-

is necessary, not the assistance; which opinion is the most groundless and worthless that ever offered to take possession of the Christian Church. And I am persuaded, many learned men among yourselves scorn it at the very heart; and I avow it, I have heard some learned and judicious Roman Catholics utterly condemn it. And well they may; for no man can affirm it, but he shall make himself a scorn to all the learned men of Christendom, whose judgments are not captivated by Roman power. And for my own part, I am clear of Jacobus Almain's opinion: "And a great wonder it is to me, that they which affirm the pope cannot err, do not affirm likewise that he cannot sin. And I verily believe they would be bold enough to affirm it, did not the daily works of the popes compel them to believe the contrary."[5] For very many of them have led lives quite contrary to the Gospel of Christ; nay, such lives as no Epicurean monster, storied out to the world, hath outgone them in sensuality, or other gross impiety, if their own historians be true. Take your choice of John the Thirteenth,[6] about the year 966; or of Sylvester the Second, about the year 999; or John the Eighteenth, about the year 1003; or Benedict the Ninth, about the year 1033; or Boniface the Eighth, about the year 1294; or Alexander the Sixth, about the year 1492. And yet these, and their like, must be infallible in their dictates and conclusions of faith. Do your own believe it? Surely no. For Alphonsus a Castro tells us plainly: "That he doth not believe that any man can be so gross and impudent a flatterer of the pope, as to attribute this unto him, that he can neither err nor mistake in expounding the Holy

morum esse a pontifice; non partim a pontifice, partim a concilio. [But on the contrary; for first the Lord said to Peter alone, "I have prayed for thee"; and "feed My sheep"; He did not say those words to Peter and a Council. Also He called Peter alone a rock and a foundation, not Peter with a Council: from which it is plain that the whole weight of lawful Councils comes from the Pope; not partly from the Pope and partly from the Council.—Bellarmin.] *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 3. § [34. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 810 B.]

[5] Et mirum est quod adversarii non asserant eum impeccabilem: et credo assererent, nisi quotidiana summorum pontificum opera ad credendum oppositum compellerent. [And it is wonderful that our adversaries do not declare a Pope incapable of sinning; and I believe they would declare him to be so, unless the daily actions of the Popes compelled us to believe the opposite.]—[*Libellus*] *de authoritate ecclesiæ*, [*seu sacrorum conciliorum eam repræsentantium*, editus a magistro Jacobo] Almain, [Senonensis diœcesis Doctore Theologo, contra Thomam de Vio Dominicanum, qui his diebus suis scriptis nisus est omnem Ecclesiæ Christi sponsæ potestatem enervare.] cap. x. ad fin. [apud *Opuscula Aurea* Jac. Almain. Paris. 1517. fol. lix. Et apud Gersoni. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1005. ed. Dupin.]

[6] Platina et Onuphrius in Vitis eorum, [*Vitæ Pontificum et Annotat. ibid.*]

[CHAPTER XI.]

Scripture."[7] This comes home; and therefore it may well be thought it hath taken a shrewd purge. For these words are express in the edition at Paris, 1534; but they are not to be found in that at Cologne, 1539; nor in that at Antwerp, 1556; nor in that at Paris, 1571. Harding[8] says indeed, Alphonsus

[7] [The passage in the first edition of this work at Paris, 1534, and in that of Cologne, 1539, (for Laud is incorrect in speaking of its exclusion in that edition,) runs thus: Omnis enim homo errare potest in fide, etiam si papa sit. Nam de Liberio papa constat fuisse Arrianum, et Anastasium papam favisse Nestorianis qui historias legerit non dubitat. Quod autem alii dicunt eum qui erraverit in fide obstinate, jam non esse papam, ac per hoc affirmant papam non posse esse hæreticum, est in re seria verbis velle jocari. Ad hunc enim modum quis posset citra impudentiam asserere nullum fidelem posse in fide errare, nam cum hæreticus fuerit jam desinet esse fidelis. Non enim dubitamus, an hæreticum esse, et papam esse, coire in unum possint, sed id quærimus, an hominem qui alias in fide errare potuisset, dignitas pontificialis efficiat, a fide indeviabilem.] Non enim credo aliquem esse adeo impudentem Papæ assentatorem, ut ei tribuere hoc velit, ut nec errare aut in interpretatione sacrarum literarum hallucinari possit. [Nam cum constet plures eorum adeo illiteratos esse ut grammaticam penitus ignorent, qui fit ut sacras literas interpretari possent. For every man can err in the faith, even if he be Pope; for there is no doubt that Pope Liberius was an Arian; and that Pope Anastasius inclined to the Nestorians, no one doubts who has read the Histories. But for some to say that he who has erred obstinately in the faith can no longer be Pope, and thus to prove that the Pope cannot be a heretic, is simply to play with words over a serious matter. For in this fashion some one could assert impudently that none of the faithful can err in the faith; for when he became a heretic he can no longer be one of the faithful. For the matter on which we doubt is not whether to be a heretic and to be Pope can go together; but we are enquiring whether the papal dignity makes a man who else could have erred about the faith, unable to wander from the faith. For I do not think that there was ever yet a supporter of the Papacy so shameless that he should wish to attribute this to him, that neither can he err nor be deluded in the interpretation of Holy Scripture. For since it is well known that some of them were so illiterate as to be entirely ignorant of grammar, how is it possible that they could interpret the sacred literature.]—Alfonsi de Castro, [Zamorensi, ordinis Minorum,] *adversus* [*omnes*] *hæreses*, [lib. xiii. In quibus recensentur et revincuntur omnes hæreses quarum memoria extat, quæ ab apostolorum tempore ad hoc usque sæculum in ecclesia ortæ sunt. In which are examined and refuted all the heresies which are remembered, and which have originated from the time of the Apostles to this century.—*Prelo Ascensiano*,] lib. i. cap. 4. [fol. ix. The alterations seem to have been made in the edition of 1545, when the author was at Trent. In the dedication prefixed to the later editions, the author professes to have altered the work so as almost to have made it a new one.] —And the Gloss confesses it plainly, in [Decret. par. ii.] C[aus.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] 1. cap. (ix.) *A recta ergo*. [*ubi sup.* p. 271. note 34.]

[8] [A great champion of Romanism in the reigns of the Tudors; Fellow of New College; took refuge at Louvain after Queen Mary's death; carried on a controversy with Bishop Jewel of Salisbury. The passage of Harding referred to in the text is: "Alphonsus saith somewhat to your purpose, if the tale which you make him to tell were his own. Certainly, if he once wrote it, when he began first to write, afterward with better advice he revoked it. For in the books of the later prints these words, which you rehearse, are not found. Thus you say, (*Defence*, p. 715.)—'Alphonsus de Castro, one of Mr. Harding's own special doctors,

left it out of himself, in the following editions. Well: First, Harding says this, but proves it not; so I may choose whether I will believe him or no. Secondly, Be it so, that he did,—that cannot help their cause a whit. For, say he did dislike the sharpness of the phrase, or aught else in this speech, yet he altered not his judgment of the thing; for in all these later editions he speaks as home, if not more than in the first; and says expressly, "That the pope may err, not only as a private person, but as pope."[9] And in difficult cases, he adds, that the pope ought to

saith: Non dubitamus, an hæreticum esse, et Papam esse, coire in unum possent, etc. The matter on which we doubt is not whether to be a heretic and to be a Pope can go together. For I do not believe, etc.—Non enim credo, etc.' (Alphonsus *de Hæresibus*, lib. i. cap. 4.) This very saying Mr. Jewel bringeth in likewise against the popes, in the *Defence*, p. 615, under the name of Alphonsus, etc."—A] Detection of [sundry foul] errors, etc. uttered . . . by Mr. Jewel, [in . . . a *Defence of the Apologie*, etc. (*The falsehood of the Epistle to the Queen detected*,) by Thomas] Harding, [D.D. Lovan. 1568. p. 6. *v.*]—[And, "'Certainly,' saith he to me, (*Defence*, p. 617. 1. 2.) 'your own doctor Alphonsus saith, De Liberio Papa, constat fuisse Arianum. Touching Pope Liberius, it is well known he was an Arian.' And where saith Alphonsus thus? Marry, saith Mr. Jewel, in his marginal quotation, *Alphonsus contra Hæres.* lib. i. cap. 4. But read that chapter who will, verily in the books of sundry prints that I have seen, he saith it not. If it were once so printed, and afterward by the author revoked, it ought not to be alleged."—*Ibid.* (*Answer to the view of Untruths*,)] p. 64.

[9] Cælestinus erravit non solum ut privata persona, sed ut papa, etc. [Celestine erred not only as a private person, but as Pope. His words are: Omnis enim homo errare potest in fide, etiam si papa sit. Nam de Liberio papa refert Platina illum sensisse cum Arrianis, et Anastasium II. pontificem favisse Nestorianis, qui historias legerit, non dubitat. Cælestinum papam etiam errasse circa matrimonium fidelium, quorum alter labitur in hæresim, res est omnibus manifesta. Neque hic Cælestini error talis fuit, qui soli negligentiæ imputari debeat, ita ut illum errasse dicamus veluti privatam personam, et non ut papam qui in qualibet re seria definienda consulere debet viros doctos: quoniam hujusmodi Cælestini definitio habebatur in antiquis Decretalibus in cap. Laudabilem, titulo de Conversione Infidelium quem ipse vidi et legi. Si ergo nulli hominum jure tenemur in interpretatione sacrarum literarum credere, propterea quod quilibet homo solus errare potest, erit necessario judicium interpretationis penes totam ecclesiam. For any man can err in the faith, even if he be pope. For Platina relates about Pope Liberius that he agreed with the Arians, and no one who has read history doubts that Pope Anastasius II. inclined to the Nestorians. Also that Pope Celestine erred about the marriage relation of the faithful when one of the two falls into heresy, we all know. Nor was this error of Celestine of the class which can be attributed to mere negligence, so that we can say he erred as a private person and not as pope, who ought to consult the learned when he defines an important matter; since this definition of Celestine was contained in the ancient Decretals in chapter Laudabilem, entitled "About the Conversion of the Heathen," and I have seen it and read it. If therefore we are rightly bound to trust no man in the interpretation of Scripture, because every single man can err, it will be a necessary conclusion that the decision of interpretation rests with the whole Church.]—Alphons. a Castro, *adv. Hæreses*, lib. i. cap. 4. [*Op.*, col. 20. E. ed. Paris. 1571. *ubi sup.* p. 107. note 31. With this agrees the edition of Antwerp, 1556, the last published in the author's lifetime.]

[CHAPTER XI.]

consult *viros doctos*, "men of learning." And this also was the opinion of the ancient Church of Christ, concerning the pope and his infallibility. For thus Liberius, and he a pope himself, writes to Athanasius: "Brother Athanasius, if you think in the presence of God and Christ as I do, I pray subscribe this confession, which is thought to be the true faith of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, that we may be the more certain that you think concerning the faith as we do. *Ut ego etiam persuasus sim inhæsitanter*, 'that I also may be persuaded without all doubting,' of those things which you shall be pleased to command me."[10] Now I would fain know, if the pope at that time were, or did think himself, infallible, how he should possibly be more certainly persuaded of any truth belonging to the faith, by Athanasius's concurring in judgment with him. For nothing can make infallibility more certain than it is; at least, not the concurring judgment of that is fallible, as St. Athanasius was. Beside, the pope complimented exceeding low, that would submit his unerring judgment to be commanded by Athanasius, who, he well knew, could err. Again in the case of Easter, which made too great a noise in the Church of old, "Very many men called for St. Ambrose's judgment in that point, even after the definition of the Church of Alexandria and the bishop of Rome."[11] And this I presume they would not have done, had they then conceived either the pope or his Church infallible. And thus it continued down till Lyra's time; for he says expressly: "That many popes, as well as other inferiors, have not only erred, but even quite apostatized from the faith."[12] And yet now nothing but "infal-

[10] [ταύτῃ οὖν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ, ἀδελφὲ Ἀθανάσιε, τῇ οὔσῃ μόνῃ καὶ ἀληθῶς πίστει ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, εἰ ὁμοφρονεῖς μοι, ὡς ἐπὶ κρίσει θεοῦ καὶ Χρίστου γράψον μοι, εἰ οὕτω φρονεῖς καθὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ τὰ ἴσα ἐν τῇ ἀληθινῇ πίστει·] ἵνα κἀγὼ πεποιθὼς ὦ, ἀδιακρίτως περὶ ὧν ἀξιοῖς κελεύειν μοι.—Liberius in *Epist. ad Athanas.* apud S. Athanas. [*Op.*,] tom. i. p. 42. ed. Paris. 1608. Et ed. Paris. Latino-Græc. 1627. [Et tom ii. p. 664. C. ed. Benedict.—This Epistle was formerly generally considered to be spurious, but see *D. C. B.*, vol. iii. *s.v.* Liberius.]

[11] [Unde necesse fuit, quia etiam] post Ægyptiorum supputationes, et Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ definitiones, episcopi quoque Romanæ ecclesiæ, per literas plerique meam adhuc expectant sententiam, quid existimem [scribere] de die paschæ. [Wherefore it was necessary, that after the computations of the Egyptians and the definitions of the Church of Alexandria, the bishops of the Roman Church, very many of them by letter, should look for my opinion, and ask me to write what I thought about the keeping of Easter.]—S. Ambros. lib. x. *Epist.* lxxxiii. [Epistol. class. i. Epist. xxiii. Fratribus Episcopis, etc. § 8. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 882. D.]

[12] Ex quo patet quod ecclesia non consistit in hominibus ratione potestatis vel dignitatis ecclesiasticæ, vel sæcularis, quia multi principes et

libility" will serve their turns. And sometimes they have not only taken upon them to be infallible *in cathedra*, "in their chair of decision," but also to prophesy infallibly out of the Scripture. But prophetical Scripture, such as the Revelation is, was too dangerous for men to meddle with, which would be careful of their credit in not erring. For it fell out in the time of Innocent the Third, and Honorius the Third, as Aventine tells us: "That the then popes assured the world, that destruction was at hand to Saracens, Turks, and Mahometans; which the event showed were notorious untruths."[13] And it is remarkable which happened anno 1179.[14] For then, in a council held at Rome, Pope Alexander the Third condemned Peter Lombard of heresy; and he lay under that damnation for thirty and six years, till Innocent the Third restored him, and condemned his accusers. Now Peter Lombard was then condemned for something which he had written about the human nature of our Saviour Christ. So here was a great mystery of the faith in hand; something about the Incarnation. And the pope was *in cathedra*, and that in a council of three hundred archbishops and bishops; and in this

summi pontifices, et alii inferiores inventi sunt apostatasse a fide: [propter quod ecclesia consistit in illis personis in quibus est notitia vera et confessio fidei et veritatis. From which it is evident that the Church does not depend on men according to their ecclesiastical power and dignity, for many chief men and supreme pontiffs and other dignitaries less in rank have been known to be apostate from the faith; but the Church consists in those persons in whom there is the true knowledge and the confession of the true faith.—Nicholas de] Lyra, [*Postill.*] *in S. Matth.* xvi. 18. [apud *Bibl. Latin. cum Gloss. ordinar.*]

[13] [Inter hæc] pontifices Romani ex [sacra] historia, [nempe libro quam Joannis Divinationem appellant, fatum exitii Saracenis, Turcis, et Machometicæ superstitioni adventasse interpretantur, classicum clangunt, ad arma ingeminant.] Quæ mendacissima esse exitus probavit. [At this time the Roman popes interpreted passages out of the sacred history, notably in the book which is called the Revelation of St. John the Divine, to prove that the fated time of destruction was come for the Saracens, the Turks, and the Mahometans, and they sounded the trumpet, and redoubled their call to arms. . . . But the result has proved their interpretations to be most false.—Io.] Aventini *Annal. Boiorum*, lib. vii. p. 529. ed. Basil. 1580.

[14] Baron. *An.* 1179. No. 13. [Delata fuit accusatio in eodem concilio (sc. Lateranensi) a quibusdam Alexandro Papæ adversus scriptum Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis, quod male sensisset de Christi humanitate, et in aliis fidei articulis ab ecclesia Catholica deviasset. Tunc Alexander papa has dedit literas ad Guillelmum archiepiscopum Senonensem his verbis . . . ad abrogationem pravæ doctrinæ Petri quondam Parisiensis episcopi, qua dicitur, etc. An accusation was brought in the same council (the Lateran) by some to Pope Alexander against the writings of Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, that he had given wrong opinions on Christ's human nature, and had in other matters of faith strayed from the Catholic Church. Then Pope Alexander gave this letter to William, Archbishop of Sens, with these words, that he should annul this false doctrine of Peter, formerly Bishop of Paris, in which it is said, etc.]

[CHAPTER XI.]

council he condemned Peter Lombard, and in him, his opinion about the Incarnation; and therefore, of necessity, either Pope Alexander erred, and that *in cathedra*, as pope, in condemning him; or Pope Innocent in restoring him. The truth is, Pope Alexander had more of Alexander the Great than of St. Peter in him; and being accustomed to warlike employments, he understood not that which Peter Lombard had written about this mystery. And so he and his learned assistants condemned him unjustly.

A. C. p. 68.

8. And whereas you profess after, "That you hold nothing against your conscience,"—I must ever wonder much how that can be true, since you hold this of the pope's infallibility, especially as being "prophetical in the conclusion." If this be true, why do you not lay all your strength together, all of your whole society, and make this one proposition evident? For all controversies about matters of faith are ended, and without any great trouble to the Christian world, if you can but make this one proposition good, "That the pope is an infallible judge." Till then, this shame will follow you infallibly and eternally, that you should make the pope, a mere man, *principium fidei*, "a principle or author of faith"; and make the mouth of him, whom you call Christ's vicar, sole judge, both of Christ's word, be it never so manifest, and of His Church, be she never so learned and careful of His truth. And, for conclusion of this point, I would fain know—since this had been so plain, so easy a way, either to prevent all divisions about the faith, or to end all controversies, did they arise—why this brief but most necessary proposition, "The Bishop of Rome cannot err in his judicial determinations concerning the faith," is not to be found, either in letter or sense, in any Scripture, in any Council, or in any Father of the Church, for the full space of a thousand years and more after Christ? For had this proposition been true, and then received in the Church, how weak were all the primitive fathers, to prescribe so many rules and cautions for avoidance of heresy, as Tertullian, and Vincentius Lirinensis, and others do; and to endure such hard conflicts as they did, and with so many various heretics; to see Christendom so rent and torn by some distempered councils, as that of Ariminum, the second of Ephesus, and others; nay, to see the "whole world almost become Arian, to the amazement of itself"; and yet all this time, not so much as call in this necessary assistance of the pope, and let the world know "that the bishop of Rome

was infallible"; that so in his decision all differences might cease! For either the fathers of the Church, Greek as well as Latin, knew this proposition to be true, "That the pope cannot err judicially in matters belonging to the faith," or they knew it not. If you say they knew it not, you charge them with a base and unworthy ignorance, no ways like to overcloud such and so many learned men, in a matter so necessary and of such infinite use to Christendom. If you say they knew it, and durst not deliver this truth, how can you charge them which durst die for Christ, with such cowardice towards His Church? And if you say they knew it, and withheld it from the Church, you lay a most unjust load upon those charitable souls, which loved Christ too well to imprison any truth, but likely to make or keep peace in His Church Catholic over the world. But certainly, as no divine of worth did then dream of any such infallibility in him, so is it a mere dream, or worse, of those modern divines who affirm it now.[15] And as St. Augustine[16] sometimes spoke of the Donatists, and their absurd limiting the whole Christian Church to Africa only; so may I truly say of the Romanists confining all Christianity to the Roman doctrine, governed by the pope's infallibility: "I verily persuade myself, that even the Jesuits themselves laugh at this; and yet unless they say this, which they cannot but blush while they say, they have nothing at all to say. But what is this to us? We envy no man. If the pope's decision be infallible, *legant*, 'let them read' it to us out of the Holy Scripture, and we will believe it."

9. In the meantime, take this with you,—that most certain it is, That the pope hath no infallibility to attend his cathedral judgment in things belonging to the faith. For, first, Besides the silence of impartial antiquity, divers of your own confess it, yea, and prove it too by sundry instances.[17]

[15] "The wild extent of the Pope's infallibility and jurisdiction, is a mistake." These are the words of a great Roman Catholic, uttered to myself. But I will spare his name, because he is living, and I will not draw your envy upon him.

[16] Puto quod ipsi etiam rideant, cum hoc audiunt: et tamen nisi hoc dicant, quod erubescunt si dicant, non habent omnino quod dicant. Sed quid ad nos? Nemini invidemus. Hoc nobis legant de Scripturis Sanctis, et credimus. [I think even they themselves laugh when they hear this; and yet unless they say what it makes them blush to say, they have nothing at all to say. But what does it matter to us? We are jealous of no one. Let them prove this to us out of the Holy Scripture and we believe.]—S. Augustin. [*contra Donatistas Epistol. vulg.*] *de Unitat. Ecclesiæ*, cap. xvii. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 368. D. Migne, ix. 425.]

[17] Papa non solum errore personali, sed et errore judiciali potest errare in materia fidei, [sicut et in aliis materiis. The Pope can err in a matter of faith, as he does in other matters, not

[CHAPTER XI.]

10. Secondly, There is a great question among the learned, both schoolmen and controversers, "Whether the pope coming to be an heretic may be deposed?" And it is learnedly disputed by Bellarmine.[18] The opinions are different; for the Canon Law says expressly, "He may be judged and deposed by the Church in case of heresy."[19] John de Turrecremata is of opinion, "That the pope is to be deposed by the Church, so soon as he becomes an heretic, though as yet not a manifest one, because he is already deprived by Divine right";[20] and recites another opinion, "That the pope cannot be deposed, though he fall into secret or manifest heresy." Cajetan[21] thinks that the "pope cannot be deposed but for a manifest heresy, and that then he is not deposed *ipso facto*, but must be deposed by the Church."[22] Bellarmine's own opinion is, "That if the pope become a manifest heretic, he presently

only by personal error, but also by judicial error.]—Almain *L[ibello] de Author. Ecclesiæ*, cap. x. [fol. lix. *ubi sup.* p. 307. note 5.]

[18] [Bellarmin.] *de Rom. Pont.* lib. ii. cap. 30. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 699. *et seqq.* His conclusion is: Est ergo quinta opinio vera, papam hæreticum manifestum per se desinere esse papam et caput. . . . quare ab ecclesia posse eum judicari, et puniri. Hæc est sententia omnium veterum patrum, etc. There is therefore a fifth opinion and the true one, that a Pope who is quite evidently a heretic ceases to be Pope and head. . . . Wherefore he can be judged by the Church and punished. This is the decision of all old fathers. —col. 702. C.]

[19] [Si papa suæ et fraternæ salutis negligens deprehendatur, inutilis, et remissus in operibus suis, et insuper a bono taciturnus, quod magis officit sibi et omnibus: nihilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim secum ducit, primo mancipio gehennæ, cum ipso plagis multis in æternum vapulaturus. Hujus culpas istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus: quia cunctos ipse judicaturus, a nemine est judicandus, ni]si [deprehendatur] a fide devius: [pro cujus perpetuo statu universitas fidelium tanto instantius orat, etc. If the Pope is found to have neglected his own and his brothers' salvation, to be useless and careless in his duties, and quite dumb about good things, which is a great hindrance to himself and others; none the less he leads with him innumerable people, hand by hand, to the first slavery of hell, to be beaten with many stripes for ever in his company. His faults no mortal can dare to expose, for he himself is to judge all and none may judge him, unless he be found to have wandered from the faith. (Therefore) for his perpetual welfare the whole body of the faithful prays with all the more insistence.—Decret. par. i.] Distinct. xl. cap. [vi. ex dictis Bonifacii,] *Si papa.*

[20] Sit jure divino papatu privatus. ["He may be deprived of his Papacy by divine law." This is the sense, not the words, of the passage.]—Joann. de Turrecremata, [*Summ.*] lib. iv. par. 2. cap. 20. [ad. 1.]—Et Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. ii. cap. 30.

[21] [Tommaso di Vio, called Cajetan because he was born at Gaeta, sent by Leo X. into Germany to put down Luther; famous as a scholar.]

[22] Papa, factus hæreticus, non est ipso facto, vel jure divino, vel humano, depositus, sed deponendus . . . . si a fide deviat, deponendus est. A Pope who has become a heretic is not by the fact alone, whether under divine law or under human law, actually deposed, but he may be deposed. If he wanders from the faith he may be deposed.]—Cajetan. *Tract.* [*i.*] *de auctoritat. Papæ et Concilii*, cap. xx. [in init. apud *Opusc. omnia* Thomæ de Vio. Cajetani, tom. i. p. 21. ed. Lugd. 1662.]

ceases to be pope and head of the Church, and may then be judged and punished by the Church."[23] Bellarmine hath disputed this very learnedly and at large, and I will not fill this discourse with another man's labours. The use I shall make of it runs through all these opinions, and through all alike. And, truly, the very question itself supposes, that a pope may be an heretic. For if he cannot be an heretic, why do they question whether he can be deposed for being one? And if he can be one, then whether he can be deposed by the Church before he be manifest, or not till after, or neither before nor after, or which way they will, it comes all to one for my purpose. For I question not here his deposition for his heresy, but his heresy. And I hope none of these learned men, nor any other, dare deny, but that if the pope can be an heretic, he can err; for every heresy is an error, and more. For it is an error ofttimes against the errant's knowledge, but ever with the pertinacy of his will. Therefore out of all, even your own grounds, if the pope can be an heretic, he can err grossly, he can err wilfully; and he that can so err, cannot be infallible in his judgment, private or public: for if he can be an heretic, he can, and doubtless will, "judge for his heresy," if the Church let him alone. And you yourselves maintain his deposition lawful, to prevent this. I verily believe Albert Pighius foresaw this blow; and therefore he is of opinion, "That the pope cannot become an heretic at all."[24] And though Bellarmine[25] favour him so far as to say his opinion is probable, yet he is so honest as to add that "the common opinion of divines is against him." Nay, though he labour hard to excuse Pope Honorius the First from the heresy of the Monothelites;[26] and says that Pope Adrian was deceived, who thought him one, yet he confesses: "That Pope Adrian the Second, with the council then held at Rome, and the eighth General Synod, did think that the pope might be

[23] Papa hæreticus manifestus per se desinit esse papa et caput, etc. Et tum potest ab ecclesia judicari, et puniri. [The Pope who is an evident heretic for this reason ceases to be Pope and head, etc. And then he can be judged by the Church and punished.] —Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. ii. cap. 30. etc. [*ubi sup.* p. 314. note 18.]

[24] *Hierarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ* [*assertio,*] per [Albertum] Pighium, [Campensem,] lib. iv. cap. 8. [fol. cxxxi. *et seqq.* ed. Colon. 1538.]

[25] [Opinio Alberti Pighii (v. sup.) . . . probabilis est, et defendi potest facile . . . Quia tamen non est certa, et] communis opinio est in contrarium. [The opinion of Albert Pighius is probable, and can easily be defended; however it is not certain, and the common opinion is against it.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. ii. cap. 30. § 2.

[26] [Bellarmin.] *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 11.

[CHAPTER XI.]

judged in the cause of heresy; and that the condition of the Church were most miserable, if it should be constrained to acknowledge a wolf manifestly raging for her shepherd."[27] And here again I have a question to ask, Whether you believe the eighth General Council, or not? If you believe it, then you see the pope can err, and so he not infallible. If you believe it not, then in your judgment that General Council errs, and so that not infallible.

11. Thirdly, It is altogether in vain, and to no use, that the pope should be infallible, and that according to your own principles. Now, "God and nature make nothing in vain"; therefore, either the pope is not infallible, or at least God never made him so. That the infallibility of the pope, had he any in him, is altogether vain and useless, is manifest; for if it be of any use, it is for the settling of truth and peace in the Church, in all times of her distraction. But neither the Church, nor any member of it, can make any use of the pope's infallibility that way; therefore it is of no use or benefit at all. And this also is as manifest as the rest. For before the Church, or any particular man, can make any use of this infallibility, to settle him and his conscience, he must either know or believe that the pope is infallible; but a man can neither know nor believe it. And first, for belief. For if the Church or any Christian man can believe it, he must believe it either by Divine or by human faith. Divine faith cannot be had of it; for, as is before proved, it hath no ground in the "written word of God." Nay, to follow you closer, it was never delivered by any tradition of the Catholic Church. And for human faith, no rational man can possibly believe, having no word of God to overrule his understanding, that he which is "fallible in the means," as yourselves confess the pope is,[28] can possibly be "infallible in the conclusion." And were it so that a rational man could have human faith of this infallibility, yet that neither is, nor ever can be, sufficient to make the pope infallible;

[27] Tamen non possumus negare, quin Hadrianus cum Romano concilio, imo et tota Synodus VIII. generalis senserit, in causa hæresis posse Romanum pontificem judicari. Adde, quod esset miserrima conditio Ecclesiæ, si lupum manifeste grassantem, pro pastore agnoscere cogeretur. [However we cannot deny that Adrian, together with the Roman Council, and also the whole 8th General Council, decided that in a matter of heresy the Roman Pope can be judged. Add that the condition of the Church would be most wretched if it should be compelled to acknowledge as its shepherd one who was evidently a prowling wolf.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. ii. cap. 30. § 5.

[28] Stapleton. *Relect. Controv.* [Controv.] iv. Q[uæst.] ii. Notab. 4. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 749. *ubi sup.* p. 290. note 86.]

no more than my strong belief of another man's honesty, can make him an honest man if he be not so. Now, secondly, for knowledge. And that is altogether impossible too, that either the Church, or any member of the Church, should ever know that "the pope is infallible." And this I shall make evident also out of your own principles. For your Council of Florence had told us, "That three things are necessary to every Sacrament,[29] the "matter," the "form" of the Sacrament, and the "intention of the priest,"[30] which administers it, that he intends to do as the Church doth. Your Council of Trent[31] confirms it for the "intention of the priest." Upon this ground—be it rock or sand, it is all one, for you make it rock and build upon it—I shall raise this battery against the "pope's infallibility." First, The pope, if he have any infallibility at all, he hath it as he is bishop of Rome and St. Peter's successor. This is granted.[32] Secondly, The pope cannot be Bishop of Rome, but he must be "in holy orders first." And if any man be chosen that is not so, the election is void, *ipso facto, propter errorem personæ*, "for the error of the person." This is also granted.[33] Thirdly, He that is to be made pope, can never be in holy orders, but by receiving them from one that hath power to ordain. This is notoriously known; so is it also, that with you "order is a sacrament properly so called." And if so, then the pope, when he did receive the order of deacon or priest-

[29] [Hæc] omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, [videlicet rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma, et persona ministri conferentis sacramentum cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia: quorum si aliquod desit, non perficitur sacramentum. All those sacraments require three qualities to make them complete, the proper material, the proper form of words, an administering minister who shall have the intention to effect what the Church effects by the Sacrament. And if any of these is wanting the Sacrament is not complete.]—Decretum Eugenii IV. [ad Armenos.] in Concil. Florentin. [an. 1439. apud *Concil.* tom. xiii. col. 535. A, B.]

[30] [See Note A at end of chapter.]

[31] [Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem, saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia: anathema sit. If any one should say that ministers while they celebrate and administer the Sacraments do not require this "intention" of effecting what the Church effects, let him be anathema.]—Concil. Tridentin. Sess. vii. [de Sacramentis,] Can. xi.

[32] Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 3. § [6.] Alterum Privilegium, etc. [*ubi sup.* p. 216. note III.]

[33] Constantinus ex laico papa circa ann. 767, ejectus papatu. Et Stephanus III. qui successit, habito concilio statuit, ne quis nisi per gradus ecclesiasticos ascendens pontificatum occupare auderet sub pœna anathematis. Constantine, made pope while a layman, about 767 A.D., was ejected from the Papal Throne. And Stephen, who succeeded him, held a council and decreed that no one should dare to hold the Papal Throne without ascending through the ecclesiastical ranks of orders, under pain of being anathema.—Decret. [par. I.] Distinct. lxxix. cap. [iv. ex Conc. Steph. III.] *Nullas* [*unquam.*]

[CHAPTER XI.]

hood at the hands of the bishop, did also receive a sacrament. Upon these grounds I raise my argument thus: Neither the Church, nor any member of the Church, can know that this pope which now sits, or any other that hath been, or shall be, is infallible. For he is not infallible unless he be pope; and he is not pope unless he be in holy orders; and he cannot be so unless he have received those holy orders, and that from one that had power to ordain; and those holy orders in your doctrine are a sacrament; and a sacrament is not perfectly given, if he that administers it have not *intentionem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*, "an intention to do that which the Church doth" by sacraments. Now, who can possibly tell, that the bishop which gave the pope orders, was, first, a man qualified to give them; and, secondly, so devoutly set upon his work, that he had, at the instant of giving them, an intention and purpose to do therein as the Church doth? Surely, none but that bishop himself. And his testimony of himself and his own act—such especially as, if faulty, he would be loth to confess—can neither give knowledge nor belief sufficient, that the pope, according to this canon, is in holy orders. So upon the whole matter—let the Romanists take which they will; I give them free choice—either this canon of the Council of Trent is false divinity, and there is no such intention necessary to the essence and being of a sacrament; or if it be true, it is impossible for any man to know, and for any advised man to believe, That the pope is infallible in his judicial sentences, in things belonging to the faith. And so here again a General Council, at least such an one as that of Trent is, can err, or the pope is not infallible.

12. But this is an argument *ad hominem*, good against your party only which maintain this Council. But the plain truth is, both are errors; for neither is the Bishop of Rome infallible in his judicials about the faith, nor is this intention of either bishop or priest of absolute necessity to the essence of a sacrament, so as to make void the gracious institution of Christ, in case by any tentation the priest's thoughts should wander from his work at the instant of using the essentials of a sacrament, or have in him an actual intention to scorn the Church. And you may remember, if you please, that a Neapolitan bishop,[84] then present at Trent,

[84] Minorensis episcopus fuit. [He was Bishop of Minori. . . . "Ambrosius Catharinus, who is the person the relator means by the 'Neapolitan Bishop, who,' as his Lordship says, 'disputed so learnedly' against the common opinion in the Council of Trent."—Thorold (T. C., *Laud's Labyrinth*,) p. 285. He was supported by Dominic Soto, cf. p. 360, note 53.]

disputed this case very learnedly, and made it most evident that this opinion cannot be defended, but that it must open a way for any unworthy priest to make infinite nullities in administration of the sacraments. And his arguments were of such strength, *ut cæteros theologos dederint in stuporem*,[35] "as amazed the other divines" which were present; and concluded, "That no internal intention was required in the minister of a sacrament, but that intention which did appear *opere externo*, 'in the work itself' performed by him; and that if he had unworthily any wandering thoughts—nay more, any contrary intention within him,—yet it neither did nor could hinder the blessed effect of any sacrament." And most certain it is, if this be not true—besides all other inconveniences, which are many—no man can secure himself upon any doubt or trouble in his conscience, that he hath truly and really been made partaker of any sacrament whatsoever—no, not of baptism; and so by consequence be left in doubt whether he be a Christian or no, even after he is baptized: whereas it is most impossible that Christ should so order His sacraments, and so leave them to His Church, as that poor believers in His name, by any unworthiness of any of His priests, should not be able to know whether they have received His sacraments or not, even while they have received them. And yet, for all this, such "great lovers of truth," and such "careful pastors" over the "flock of Christ," were these Trent Fathers, that they regarded none of this, but went on in the usual track, and made their decree for the "internal intention and purpose" of the priest, and that "the sacrament was invalid without it."

13. Nay, one argument more there is, and from your own grounds too, that makes it more than manifest that "the pope can err," not "personally" only, but "judicially" also, and so teach false doctrine to the Church; which Bellarmine tells us, "No pope hath done, or can do."[36] And a maxim it is with you, "That a General Council can err, if it be not confirmed by the pope; but if it be confirmed, then it cannot err."[37] Where, first, this is very improper language; for I hope no Council is

[35] [P. Sarpi,] *Hist.* [*Concil.*] *Trident.* lib. ii. pp. 276, 277. Leidæ, an. 1622. [*ubi sup.* p. 164. note 35.]

[36] Summus pontifex cum totam ecclesiam docet, in his quæ ad fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest. [The chief pontiff, when he teaches the whole Church, can in no case err.] —Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 3. § 1. [*ubi sup.* p. 22. note 52.]

[37] Concilia Generalia a Pontifice confirmata errare non possunt. [General Councils cannot err if the Pope confirms them.]—Bellarmin. *de Concil.* [*auctoritat.*] lib. ii. cap. 2. § 1. [*ubi sup.* p. 186. note 11.]

[CHAPTER XI.]

confirmed till it be finished. And when it is finished, even before the pope's confirmation be put to it, either it hath erred, or not erred. If it have erred, the pope ought not to confirm it; and if he do, it is a void act; for no power can make falsehood truth: if it have not erred, then it was true before the pope confirmed it; so his confirmation adds nothing but his own assent: therefore his confirmation of a General Council, as you will needs call it, is at the most *signum, non causa*, "a sign," and that such as may fail, but "no cause" of the Council's not erring. But then, secondly, if a General Council, confirmed, as you would have it, by the pope, have erred, and so can err, then certainly the pope can err judicially; for he never gives a more solemn sentence for truth than when he decrees anything in a General Council: therefore if he have erred and can err there, then certainly he can err in his definitive sentence about the faith, and is not infallible. Now that he hath erred, and therefore can err, in a General Council confirmed, in which he takes upon him to teach all Christendom, is most clear and evident. For the pope teaches in and by the Council of Lateran,[38] confirmed by Innocent the Third, Christ is present in the sacrament by way of transubstantiation: and in and by the Council of Constance,[39] the administration of the blessed sacrament to the laity in one kind, notwithstanding Christ's institution of it in both kinds for all: and in and by the Council of Trent,[40] Invocation of Saints and Adoration of Images, to the great scandal of Christianity, and as

[38] [In qua (Ecclesia) idem Ipse sacerdos, et sacrificium Jesus Christus: Cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub specibus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis, pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit Ipse de nostro.] In the Church this same Jesus Christ is at once the priest and the sacrifice; Whose body and blood is really contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine, transubstantiated (changed in substance) the bread into the body, the wine into the blood, by the divine power, so that to complete our mysterious unity we may receive of His what He received of ours (viz., our flesh and blood.)—Concil. Lateranens. [IV. an. 1215.] Can. i. [*Concil.* tom. xi. par. 1. col. 143. B.]

[39] Concil. Constant. [an. 1415.] Sess. xiii. [*Concil.* tom. xii. col. 100. A. *ubi sup.* p. 302. note 126.]

[40] [Docentes fideles, sanctos . . . bonum atque utile esse suppliciter invocare . . . et ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere . . . Imagines porro . . . in templis præsertim habendas et retinendes, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam, etc. Teaching the faithful that it is good and useful to invoke the saints in our prayers, and to take refuge in their prayers for us, their help and assistance. And images specially should be kept in the churches and retained; and they ought to partake of due honour and reverence.]—Concil. Tridentin. Sess. xxv. Decretum de Invocatione [Sanctorum].

great hazard of the weak. Now, that these particulars, among many, are errors in divinity, and about the faith, is manifest both by Scripture, and the judgment of the primitive Church. For Transubstantiation, first: that was never heard of in the primitive Church, nor till the Council of Lateran, nor can it be proved out of Scripture; and, taken properly, cannot stand with the grounds of Christian religion. As for Communion in One Kind, Christ's institution is clear against that; and not only the primitive Church, but the whole Church of Christ, kept it so till within less than four hundred years. For Aquinas confesses it was so in use even to his times;[41] and he was both born and dead during the reign of Henry the Third of England. Nay, it stands yet as a monument in the very Missal,[42] against the present practice of the

[41] [Et quia crevit multitudo populi Christiani, in qua continentur senes et juvenes et parvuli, quorum quidam non sunt tantæ discretionis, ut cautelam debitam circa usum hujus sacramenti adhibeant: ideo] provide in quibusdam Ecclesiis observatur, ut populo sanguis [sumendus] non detur, [sed solum a sacerdote sumatur. And because the multitude of Christians increased, and that in it were contained old men and young men and small boys, and some of them were not so careful as to show due caution in its use; therefore, prudently in some Churches the observance grew up not to give the blood to be received by the people; but it was only received by the priest.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 3. Q[uæst.] lxxx. A[rtic.] 12. [in conclus. Migne, iv. 809.] So it was but in *some* Churches in his time. [Ex quo etiam colligi posset, quamvis in communionibus, in quibus pauci laici communicabant, fuerit usus calicis consecrati, tamen in communione totius populi, qualis fieri consuevit in Paschate, et aliis solennitatibus, non potuisse totum populum sub utraque specie communicare, quia non potuit pro tanta hominum multitudine calix aliquis ita magnus convenienter consecrari, neque ullus ex antiquissimis, qui extant, tam eximiæ magnitudinis usquam visus est.] Negare non possumus, etiam in Ecclesia Latina fuisse usum utriusque speciei, et usque ad tempora S. Thomæ durasse. [From this also we can gather, that although at communions when few lay people received, the consecrated chalice was used, yet at communions of the whole people, as, for instance, at Easter and other great festivals, the whole people could not be communicated in both kinds, because it was impossible, with such a multitude of persons, to consecrate conveniently a sufficiently large chalice, nor indeed has any been found, among the very old chalices in use, of such great size. We cannot deny that there was a reception of both kinds in the Latin Church itself, and that this lasted as late as the days of St. Thomas.—*Comment. ac Disput.*] *in Tert.* [*part. Summ.* S. Thom. Aquin. Quæst. lxxx. Artic. 12. auctore R. P. G.] Vazquez, Disput. ccxvi. cap. 3. No. 38. [tom. iii. p. 431.]

[42] Refecti cibo potuque cœlesti, Deus noster, Te supplices exoramus, [ut in Cujus hæc commemoratione percepimus, Ejus muniamur et precibus. Per, etc. Renewed with heavenly food and drink, we Thy supplicants, our God, pray Thee that we may be protected by the prayers of Him in memory of Whom we have received these (viz., the food and drink).—In proprio Missarum de Sanctis Januar. xv. [sc. S. Pauli, primi Eremitæ,] Orat. Postcommun. And Januar. xxi. [sc. S. Agnetis, V. et M.]

[Their Vasquez draws it yet lower: Negare non, etc. "We cannot deny, that in the Latin Church, there was the use of both kinds; and, that it so continued until the days of St.

[CHAPTER XI.] Church of Rome, that then it was usually given and received in both kinds. And for Invocation of Saints, though some of the ancient Fathers have some rhetorical flourishes about it, for the stirring up of devotion, as they thought, yet the Church then admitted not of the invocation of them, but only of the commemoration of the martyrs, as appears clearly in St. Augustine.[43] And when the Church prayed to God for any thing, she desired to be heard for the mercies and the merits of Christ, not for the merits of any saints whatsoever. For I much doubt this were to make the saints more than "mediators of intercession," which is all that you will acknowledge you allow the saints.[44] For, I pray, is not "by the merits" more than "by the intercession"? Did not Christ redeem us by His merits? And if God must hear our

Thomas; which was about the year of God 1260." Thus it was in the Roman Church.

But as for the Greek, the world knows it did never but communicate under both kinds. These open confessions spare us the labour of quoting the several testimonies of all ages. Else it had been easy to show in the Liturgy of St. Basil and Chrysostom, the priest was wont to pray, "Vouchsafe, O Lord to give us Thy Body and Thy Blood; and by us, to Thy people:" how, in the Order of Rome, the Archdeacon, taking the chalice from the Bishop's hand, confirmeth all the receivers with the Blood of our Lord: and from Ignatius's ἓν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις, "one cup distributed to all," to have descended along through the clear records of St. Cyprian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustin, Leo, Gelasius, Paschasius, and others, to the very time of Hugo and Lombard, and our Halensis; and to show how St. Cyprian would not deny the Blood of Christ to those that should shed their blood for Christ; how St. Austin with him makes a comparison betwixt the blood of the legal sacrifices which might not be eaten, and this blood of our Saviour's sacrifice which all must drink. But what need allegations to prove a yielded truth? so as this halving of the sacrament is a mere novelty of Rome; and such a one as their own Pope Gelasius sticks not to accuse of no less than sacrilege.—Bishop Hall (one of Laud's Suffragans), *Works*, ix. 339-340. Ed. 1837.]

[43] [Nos autem martyribus nostris non templa sicut Diis, sed memorias sicut hominibus mortuis, quorum apud Deum vivunt spiritus, fabricamus; nec ibi erigimus altaria, in quibus sacrificemus martyribus, sed uni Deo et martyrum et nostro:] ad quod sacrificium, [sicut] homines Dei, [qui mundum in Ejus confessione vicerunt,] suo loco et ordine nominantur; non tamen a sacerdote, qui sacrificat, *invocantur*. [Deo quippe, non ipsis sacrificat, quamvis in memoria sacrificet eorum: quia Dei sacerdos est non illorum. Ipsum vero sacrificium corpus est Christi. We do not build churches for our martyrs as if they were gods, but memorials as to dead men whose spirits live with God; nor do we erect altars in the churches, on which to sacrifice to martyrs, but to sacrifice to the one God, the martyrs' God and our God, at which sacrifice they, as men of God who overcame the world by their confession of Him, are named in their proper place and order; but they are not *invoked* by the priest who sacrifices. He sacrifices to God, not to them, although he sacrifices in their memory, because he is God's priest, not theirs. But the real sacrifice is the body of Christ.]—S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xxii. cap. 10. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 673. G. Migne, vii. 772.]

[44] Bellarmine says that the saints are able to be mediators between God and other men in this sense that they can ask Him to forgive their debt.—Bellarmin. *de Sanct. Beatitud.* lib. i. cap. 20. § [12. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 751. C.]

prayers for the "merits of the saints," how much fall they short of sharers in the "mediation of redemption"? [45] You may think of this. For such prayers as these the Church of Rome makes at this day, and they stand—not without great scandal to Christ and Christianity—used, and authorized to be used in the Missal. For instance, upon the Feast of St. Nicolas you pray "that God, by the merits and prayers of St. Nicolas, would deliver you from the fire of hell." [46] And upon the Octaves of St. Peter and St. Paul, you desire God "that you may obtain the glory of eternity by their merits." [47] And on the Feast of St. Bonaventure, you pray "that God would absolve you from all your sins by the interceding merits of Bonaventure." [48] And for Adoration of Images,

[45] Redemptores nostri aliquo modo, id est, secundum aliquid, [non simpliciter, et largo modo, non in rigore verborum esse dicantur. They may be said to be our redeemers in a certain sense and after a certain fashion, not purely and in full fashion, not in exactness of words.]—Bellarmin. *de Indulgentiis*, lib. i. cap. 4. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 426 C. 427. A, B.]—Et sanctos appellat numina Bellarminus, *de Imaginib. Sanct.* lib. ii. cap. 23. § 3. [And Bellarmine calls the saints numina! *i.e.* deities.] Now if this word *numen* signify anything else besides God Himself, or the power of God, or the oracle of God, let Bellarmine show it, or A. C. for him.—[Thorold (T. C., *Laud's Labyrinth*,) p. 293, says, "in the place he (Laud) cites, there is not the least shadow, or intimation, of any such matter, his (Bellarmine's) whole discourse there being of Images and not of the Saints." This is true, and there seems to be some ground for supposing not only the reference to be wrong, which it is, but that Bellarmine does not apply the term *Numina* to the saints. The only passage in Bellarmine's Treatises which the present Editor (this is Dr. Scott) has met with where the word occurs, is, *De Imaginib. Sanct.* lib. ii. cap. 8. § ult. Unde Lampridius ea simulacra ibidem appellat Numina; numina autem non vocantur imagines, nisi proponantur adorandæ pro Diis. (Whence Lampridius calls those images in that passage Numina. But images are not called numina, unless they are set forward to be adored as gods.) And in the Preface prefixed to the Dissertations on this subject, Bellarmine confines the terms *Numen*, and *Divinum Numen*, to God Himself.]

[46] [Deus, Qui beatum Nicolaum pontificem innumeris decorasti miraculis: tribue, quæsumus,] ut ejus meritis et precibus a Gehennæ incendiis liberemur. [God, Who hast adorned the blessed Pontiff Nicholas with countless miracles, we pray that by his merits and prayers we may be freed from the fire of hell.]—In proprio Missarum de Sanctis, Decemb. vi. [sc. Fest. S. Nicolai, Episcopi et M.]

[47] [Deus, Cujus dextera beatum Petrum ambulantem in fluctibus ne mergeretur, erexit, et coapostolum ejus Paulum tertio naufragantium de profundo pelagi liberavit: exaudi nos propitius, et concede,] ut amborum meritis æternitatis gloriam consequamur. [God, Whose right hand raised the blessed Peter when he walked on the waves and saved him from drowning, and delivered his fellow apostle Paul three times shipwrecked from the depths of the sea, hear us mercifully, and grant that by the merits of both we may attain the glory of eternity.]—*Ibid.* Jul. vi. [sc. in Oct. SS. Apostol. Petri et Pauli.]

[48] Ejus intercedentibus meritis ab omnibus nos absolve peccatis. [By his merits interceding for us, absolve us from all our sins.]—*Ibid.* Julii xiv. [sc. Fest. St. Bonaventuræ, Episcopi et Conf.—In the Roman Missal, the Office of St. Bonaventura contains the following collect: Deus, Qui populo

[CHAPTER XI.]

the ancient Church knew it not.[49] And the modern Church of Rome is too like to paganism in the practice of it, and driven to scarce intelligible subtleties in her servants' writings that defend it; and this without any care had of millions of souls unable to understand her subtleties or shun her practice. Did I say, "the modern Church of Rome is grown too like paganism in this point"? And may this speech seem too hard? Well, if it do, I will give a double account of it. The one is, It is no harsher expression than they of Rome use of the Protestants, and in cases in which there is no show or resemblance. For Becanus tells us, "It is no more lawful to receive the Sacrament as the Calvinists receive it, than it is to worship idols with the ethnics."[50] And Gregory de Valentia enlarges it to more points than one, but with no more truth: "The sectaries of our times," saith he, "seem to err culpably in more things than the Gentiles."[51] This is easily

Tuo æternæ salutis beatum Bonaventuram ministrum tribuisti: præsta, quæsumus, ut, quem Doctorem vitæ habuimus in terris, intercessorem habere mereamur in cœlis. God, Who didst give the blessed Bonaventura to be a minister of eternal salvation to Thy people, grant, we beseech Thee, that we may deserve him as intercessor for us in heaven, whom we have obeyed as the teacher of life on earth.—The Paris Missal has an office quite different; but not with the words quoted by Laud, which may probably be found in some local Use.]

[49] In Optatus' time the Christians were much troubled upon but a false report, that an image was to be placed upon the altar. What would they have done if adoration had been commanded, etc.? [Dicebatur enim illo tempore venturos Paulum et Macarium, qui interessent sacrificio, ut cum altaria solemniter aptarentur proferrent illi imaginem, quam primo in altare ponerent, et sic sacrificium offerretur. Hoc cum acciperent aures, percussi sunt et animi, et uniuscujusque lingua in hæc verba commota est, ut omnis qui hæc audieret diceret, Qui inde gustat, de sacro gustat.] Et recte dictum erat, si talem famam similis veritas sequeretur. [For at that time it was said that Paul and Macarius would come, and be present at the sacrifice, and that when the altars were solemnly decked they would bring forward the image, and place it on the altar, and then the sacrifice would be offered. When the people heard this their minds were distressed, and every tongue was moved to utter these words, which every one said who heard about these doings, Who partakes of this partakes of divine worship. And it was rightly said, if such a report was followed by a corresponding act.]—S. Optat. [Milevitan. *de Schism. Donatist.*] lib. iii. *ad fin.* [cap. 12. *Op.*, p. 67.—The image, which the Donatists had thus falsely charged the Catholics with placing on their altars, has been said to be that of the Emperor Constans.]

[50] Sicut non licet cum ethnicis idola colere. [Although it is not allowable to worship idols like the Gentiles.]—[Martin.] Becan. [*Opusc. Theologic.* tom. ii. p. 41.] *libello de fide Hæreticis servanda*, cap. viii. [3. p. 11. ed. Mogunt. 1610.]

[51] Nam ut ipse D. Thomas notat, contingit aliquando hæreticos circa plura errare quam Gentiles, ut Manichæi. Quod nos possumus vere dicere de nostri temporis sectariis, qui culpabiliter in pluribus videntur errare. [For, as Thomas says himself, it sometimes happens that the heretics err about more things than the heathen, as the Manichæans did. And this we can truly say about the heretics of our time, who seem to err in more things

said, but here is no proof. Nor shall I hold it a sufficient warrant for me to sour my language, because these men have dipped their pens in gall. The other account, therefore, which I shall give of this speech, shall come vouched both by authority and reason. And first, for authority. I could set Ludovicus Vives against Becanus, if I would, who says expressly, "that the making of feasts at the oratories of the martyrs (which St. Augustine tells us, 'the best Christians practised not,')[52] are a kind of *parentalia*, funeral-feasts, too much resembling the superstition of the Gentiles."[53] Nay, Vives need not say "resembling that superstition," since Tertullian tells us plainly, "that idolatry itself is but a kind of parentation."[54] And Vives, dying in the communion of the Church of Rome, is a better testimony against you, than Becanus or Valentia, being bitter enemies to our communion, can be against us. But I will come nearer home to you, and prove it by more of your own. For Cassander, who lived and died in your communion, says it expressly, "That in this present case of the adoration of images, you came full home to the superstition of the heathen."[55] And, secondly, for reason—I have, I think, too

than the heathen, to their shame.]—[Gregor. de] Valentia, [*Comment. Theolog.*]in[S. Thom. Aquin.][Secund. Secund. Disp. i. Q[uæst.] x. [de Infidelitate,] Punct. 3. [*Quotuplex sit infidelitas*. tom. iii. col. 452. A.]

[52] Quod quidem a Christianis melioribus not fit.—S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. viii. cap. 27. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 217. D. Migne, vii. 255.]

[53] Illa quasi parentaliæ superstitioni Gentilium simillima. [They are very like the ancestor-worship superstition practised by the heathen.]—Lud. Vives, *ibid.* [apud. Augustin. *de civitat. Dei*, etc. accedunt commentarii eruditi Joann. Ludov. Vives, Hispal. etc. ed. Francof. ac Hamburgæ, 1661, p. 820.]

[54] Quod ergo mortuis litabatur, utique parentationi deputabatur. Quæ species proinde idololatriæ est, quoniam et idololatria parentationis est species. [What therefore was offered to the dead was intended certainly for an offering to parents, and this is a kind of idolatry, since idolatry also is a kind of worship of ancestors.]—Tertull. *lib. de Spectaculis*, cap. xii. [*Op.*, p. 78. C.]

[55] Manifestius [enim] est, quam ut multis verbis explicari debeat, imaginum et simulacrorum cultum nimium invaluisse, et affectioni, seu potius superstitioni, populi plus satis indultum esse, ita, ut ad summam adorationem, quæ vel a paganis suis simulacris exhiberi consuevit, [et ad extremam vanitatem, quam ethnici in suis simulachris et imaginibus effingendis et exornandis admiserunt, nil a nostris reliqui factum esse videatur, etc. [It is quite simple and does not require much explanation that the worship of images and figures has too strong a hold, and is too much implanted in the affections or rather in the superstitions of the people, so as to make it the most complete adoration such as the pagans were accustomed to offer to their images, and so as to reach the extreme of vanity, such as the heathen used in shaping and adorning their figures and images. For our fellow Christians required to go no further than they go already.]—Cassander, in *Consult.* Artic. xxi. C. [de cultu sanctorum, cap. 4.] de Imaginibus [et simulacris, *Op.*, p. 978. ed. Paris. 1616.] Where he names divers of your own—as, namely, Durantus Mimatensis Episcopus, John Billet, Gerson, Durand, Holkot, and

[CHAPTER XI.]

much to give, that the modern Church of Rome is grown too like to paganism in this point. For the Council of Trent itself confesses, "that to believe there is any divinity in images, is to do as the Gentiles did by their idols."[56] And though, in some words after, the fathers of that Council seem very religiously careful "that all occasion of dangerous error be prevented";[57] yet the doctrine itself is so full of danger, that it works strongly, both upon the learned and unlearned, to the scandal of religion, and the perverting of truth. For the unlearned first: How it works upon them, by whole countries together, you may see by what happened in Asturia, Cantabria, Galetia,—no small parts of Spain. "For there the people," so he tells me that was an eye-witness, and that since the Council of Trent, "are so addicted to their worm-eaten and deformed images, that when the bishops commanded new and handsomer images to be set up in their rooms, the poor people cried for their old, would not look up to their new,—as if they did not represent the same thing."[58] And though he say this is by little and little amended, yet I believe there is very little amendment. And it works upon the learned, too, more than it

Biel, rejecting the opinion of Thomas, and other superstitions concerning images.—*Ibid.*

[56] Non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas, [vel virtus, propter quam sint colendæ, vel quod ab eis sit aliquid potendum, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda,] veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, [quæ in idolis spem suam collocabant. Not that people believe there is any divine character in them, or power for which they should be worshipped, or that anything can be got from them, or that any trust is to be placed in their images, as formerly the heathen did, who set their hope in idols.]—Concil. Tridentin. Sess. xxv. Decretum de Invocatione [Sanctorum.]

[57] [In has autem sanctas et salutares observationes si qui abusus irrepserint, eos prorsus aboleri sancta synodus vehementer cupit, ita ut nullæ falsi dogmatis imagines] et rudibus periculosi erroris occasionem [præbentes statuantur. If any abuses have crept into these holy and salutary observances, the holy Council greatly desires that they should be at once removed, so that no images may give occasion to the ignorant for any false dogma and dangerous error.]—*Ibid.*

[58] [Præcipue in montanis, ubi gentes non sunt adeo cultæ, ut in Asturiis, Cantabria, et Galetia, nostræ Hispaniæ, ubi major est indecentia, et fere irrisibilis deformitas,] et adeo gens affecta est truncis corrosis et deformibus imaginibus, ut me testi, quoties episcopi [illas renovant, et] decentiores [loco illarum] ponere jubent, [in suis parœciarum visitationibus,] veteres suas petant plorantes, [et novas neque aspicere velint, etc. Chiefly among the mountaineers, where the people are worse taught, as in the Asturias, Cantabria, and Galicia, belonging to our native Spain, where their images are more uncomely and of almost laughable ugliness, and the people are attached to worn-out pieces of wood and hideous images to such an extent that I have seen them weeping and asking for the old ones, when their bishops have replaced them and ordered new and better ones to be set up in their visitations of the parishes. Nor would they even look at the new ones.]—*Summa* [*Ecclesiastica sive Instructio Confessariorum et Pœnitentium* . . . authore] Hieronymo Llamas, par. 3. cap iii. [p. 271. ed. Mogunt. 1605.]

should. For it wrought so far upon Lamas himself, who bemoaned the former passage, as that he delivers this doctrine: "That the images of Christ, the blessed Virgin, and the saints, are not to be worshipped as if there were any divinity in the images, as they are material things made by art, but only as they represent Christ and the saints; for else it were idolatry."[59] So then, belike, according to the divinity of this casuist, a man may worship images, and ask of them, and put his trust in them, "as they represent Christ and the saints": for so there is divinity in them, though not as things, yet as representers. And what, I pray, did or could any pagan priest say more than this? For the proposition resolved is this: "The images of Christ and the saints, as they represent their exemplars, have deity or divinity in them." And now I pray, A. C., do you be judge, whether this proposition do not teach idolatry? and whether the modern Church of Rome be not grown too like to paganism in this point? For my own part, I heartily wish it were not; and that men of learning would not strain their wits to spoil the truth, and rent the peace of the Church of Christ, by such dangerous, such superstitious vanities —for better they are not, but they may be worse. Nay, these and their like have given so great a scandal among us, to some ignorant, though, I presume, well-meaning men, that they are afraid to testify their duty to God, even in His own house, by any outward gesture at all; insomuch that those very ceremonies which, by the judgment of godly and learned men, have now long continued in the practice of this Church, suffer hard measure for the Romish superstition's sake. But I will conclude this point with the saying of B. Rhenanus: "Who could endure the people," says he, "rushing into the Church like swine into a stye? Doubtless, ceremonies do not hurt the people, but profit them, so there

[59] [His words are: Solum advertimus pro rudioribus, quod Redemptoris nostri et Domini, et sanctissimæ matris Ejus, et sanctorum imagines sic venerari, et colere, ut credatur vel profiteatur in ipsis esse divinitatem imaginibus], secundum quod sunt quædam materia arte effigiata, et non secundum quod repræsentant Christum Redemptorum, et sanctos, esset idololatria, [sculpturæ et operis manuum hominum, toties in sacra Scriptura a Deo abominata et reprehensa. The ignorant must be warned against venerating or worshipping the images of our Redeemer and Lord, and of His most holy mother, as if they believed or professed that there was anything divine in the images themselves in as far as they are material and fashioned images; and not in so far as they represent Christ the Redeemer and the saints. Else it were idolatry of sculpture and the work of men's hands, so often shown in the Holy Scriptures to be abominable and reprehensible in the sight of God.]—Llamas, *ibid.* [pp. 270, 271.]

[CHAPTER XI.]

be a mean kept, and the bye be not put for the main; we place not the principal part of our piety in them."[60]

NOTE A.

This argument on the doctrine of Intention is more (*developed by Chillingworth* (Works, i. 202, ed. 1838), *one intimate friends and collaborators.*

That such or such a man is priest, not himself, much less can have any possible certainty; for it depends upon a g contingent and uncertain supposals. He that will pret certain of it must undertake to know for a certain all th that follow:

First that he was baptized with due matter. Secondly, w form of words, which he cannot know, unless he were both p attentive. Thirdly, he must know that he was baptized intention, and that is, that the minister of his baptism was n Jew, nor a Moor, nor an Atheist, (all of which kinds, I fear, gives you just cause to fear that Italy and Spain have pr few) but a Christian in heart as well as profession (otherwis the sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could inte nothing,) nor a Samosatenian nor an Arian, but one that w of having due intention, from which they that believe not tl of the Trinity are excluded by you. And, lastly, that he w drunk nor distracted at the administration of the sacrament, negligence or malice omitted his intention. Fourthly, he m take to know that the bishop which ordained him priest or completely with due matter, form, and intention; and co that he again was neither Jew, nor Moor, nor Atheist, no any such exception as is inconsistent with due intention the sacrament of orders.

Fifthly, he must undertake to know that the bishop which and consequently, that there was again none of the former priest was a priest himself; for your rule is, *Nihil dat quod*

[60] Quis ferat populum in templum irruentem, ceu in haram sues? Certe non obsunt populo ceremoniæ, sed prosunt, si modus in eis servetur, et caveamus ne πάρεργα τῶν ἔργων loco habeantur, hoc est, ne præcipuam pietatem in illis collocemus. [Who would like to have the people rushing into the Church like pigs into their sty? Certainly ceremonies do not hurt the people but help them, so long as moderation is (them, and care is taken th things are not put in the great, that is, that we d ceremonies the things w God most.]—[Beatus] Rh notat. in Tertullian. lib *milit.* [ad verba, Amp respondentes quam Domi gelio determinavit, cap. ii tull. *Op.*, p. 336. G. ed. I

his baptism, which might make him incapable of ordination, nor no invalidity in his ordination but a true priest to ordain him again, the requisite matter and form, and due intention all concurring.

Lastly, he must pretend to know the same of him that made him priest, even until he comes to the very fountain of priesthood. For take any one in the whole train and succession of ordainers, and suppose him by reason of any defect, only a supposed and not a true priest; then according to your doctrine he could not give a true but only a supposed priesthood; and they that receive it of him, and again they that derive it from them can give no better than they received; receiving nothing but a name and shadow, can give nothing but a name and shadow; and so from age to age, from generation to generation, being equivocal fathers beget only equivocal sons; no principle in geometry being more certain than this, that "the unsuppliable defect of any necessary antecedent must needs cause a nullity of all those consequences which depend upon it." In fine, to know this one thing you must first know ten thousand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known, there being no necessity that it should be true which only can qualify anything for an object of science, but only at the best a high degree of probability that it is so. But then, that of ten thousand probables no one should be false; that of ten thousand requisites, whereof any one may fail, not one should be wanting; this to me is extremely improbable, and even cousin-german to impossible. So that the assurance hereof is like a machine composed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is strangely unlikely but some will be out of order; and yet if any one be so, the whole fabric of necessity falls to the ground: and he that shall put them together, and maturely consider all the possible ways of lapsing, and nullifying a priesthood in the Church of Rome, I believe will be very inclinable to think, that it is an hundred to one, that amongst an hundred seeming priests, there is not one true one: nay, that it is not a thing very improbable that amongst those many millions which make up the Romish hierarchy, there are not twenty true. But be the truth in this what it will be, once this is certain, that they which make men's salvation (as you do) depend upon priestly absolution, and this again (as you do) upon the truth and reality of the priesthood that gives it, and this, lastly, upon a great multitude of apparent uncertainties, are not the fittest men in the world to object to others, as a horrible crime, "that they make men's salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain foundations."

Archbishop Bramhall (Works, Anglo-Catholic Library, vol. v. 210-211), *another of Laud's collaborators, writes*:

There is no opinion of the Roman Catholics of more desperate consequence, than this of the necessity of the minister's intention to

[CHAPTER XI.] the being of a sacrament, especially according to the literal sense of the word. First, for baptism, it leaves no man certain whether he be a Christian or not. It puts it into the power of an atheistical priest or such an one as Judas was, to exclude out of the Church triumphant any or all those souls, which should be admitted by him into the communion of the militant Church. For if he intend not to baptize them at all, or intend to baptize them amiss, they perish irreparably, according to their doctrine; since baptism cannot be iterated, and the nullity of this hypocritical action cannot be discovered by man, but is known to God alone, Who is the searcher of hearts. Secondly, in the Holy Eucharist, it subjects every Roman Catholic to manifest peril of idolatry, to adore bread instead of Christ; that is, if the consecrator either maliciously or negligently intend not to consecrate (of which delinquency some Romish priests have confessed themselves culpable, and have suffered for it); or if the consecrator be no priest; which may easily happen, for want of the like intention in any one of those bishops, from whom he derives his holy orders, throughout a whole series or succession of sixteen hundred years' continuance. Thirdly, in their ordination. It leaves no Church, not Rome itself, certain, whether they have holy orders or not; that is as much as to say, whether they be a Church or not. For as the failing of any one link breaks a chain in sunder, so the want of this intention in any one bishop, in a long row of seventy or eighty predecessors, breaks in sunder the chain of their succession, and leaves all those who pretend to derive from thence downwards, without holy orders.

[CHAPTER XII.

Can a Romanist be saved?

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

SECTION XXXIV.

The Countess is now getting worn out. She puts the question to Laud, Can a Romanist be saved? Laud answers they can be saved, but they run great risk, as they are wrong, and their way is full of corruptions. Certainly there is less, not greater, security for Romanists than for Members of the English Church. Their favourite argument of greater security recalls the old trick of the Donatists who used the same reasoning. On similar grounds Romanists ought to accept the Anglican doctrine of the Eucharist, because all agree that that at least is true, so far as it goes, though some hold it does not go far enough. The Anglicans accept a true substantial presence of Christ, a true and real presence in the Eucharist. Calvin accepted the real presence; Ridley believed in it. They only opposed and oppose Transubstantiation.

And further, Rome is guilty of schism. Still individuals in it can be saved; they may be ignorant or have other excuses. The Truth cannot be decided by counting heads, or estimating authorities. Laud goes on to test the argument that it is safer to be a Romanist, because then all will agree that the man's salvation is possible: he tests it by applying the same argument to the dispute about the meaning of the Descent into Hell; the Sacrament in both kinds; the character of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist; the essentials of Baptism where the Protestant Churches differ from Rome, which demands an "intention" in the Priest; the English Liturgy; the Nature of Christ; the Resurrection of the Body; and some famous heresies.

It is not true that the English are out of the Church. That implies a confusion between the Roman Church and the Catholic Church. Rome, the elder sister, tries to drive from the Home of the true Mother, the Catholic Church, all the other sisters. Rome's tyrannical character.]

[CHAPTER XII.] The conference grows to an end, and I must meet it again ere we part. For you say,

[A. C. pp. 63, 64.] ℭ. After this, we all rising, the lady asked the ℭ. whether she might be saved in the Roman faith? He answered, She might.

§ 34. ℭ. What! Not one answer perfectly related![1] My answer to this was general, for the ignorant, that could not discern the errors of that Church, so they held the foundation, and conformed themselves to a religious life. But why do you not speak out what I added in this particular?—"That it must needs go harder with the lady, even in point of salvation, because she had been brought to understand very much, for one of her condition, in these controverted causes of religion. And a person that comes to know much, had need carefully bethink himself that he oppose not known truth against the Church that made him a Christian." For salvation may be in the Church of Rome, and yet they not find it that make surest of it. Here A. C. is as confident as the Jesuit himself, "That I said expressly, 'that the lady might be saved in the Roman faith.'" Truly, it is too long since now for me to speak any more than I have already, upon my memory; but this I am sure of, that whatsoever I said of her, were it never so particular, yet was it under the conditions before expressed.

[A. C. p. 64.] ℭ. I bade her mark that.

§ 35. ℭ. I. This answer, I am sure, troubles not you; but it seems you would fain have it lay a load of envy upon me, that you profess you bade the lady so carefully "mark that." Well, you bade her "mark that." For what? For some great matter? or for some new? Not for some new, sure. For the Protestants have ever been ready for truth, and in charity, to grant as much as might be. And therefore, from the beginning, "many learned men"[2] granted

[1] Cave ne dum vis alium notare culpæ, ipse noteris calumniæ. [Take care that in your desire to brand another with a fault you are not yourself branded with a charge of false accusation.]—S. Hier. lib. iii. *advers. Pelagianos.* [Laud's reference appears to be wrong.]

[2] Nos, fatemur, sub papatu plurimum esse boni Christiani, immo omne bonum Christianum, atque etiam illinc ad nos devenisse. [Quippe fatemur, in papatu veram esse Scripturam sacram, verum baptismum, verum sacramentum altaris, veras claves ad remissionem peccatorum, verum prædicandi officium, verum Catechismum, ut sunt, oratio Dominica, decem præcepta, articuli Fidei. Dico insuper, sub papatu veram Christiani-

this. So that you needed not have put such a serious "Mark that!" upon my speech, as if none before had, or none but I would speak it. And if your "Mark that!" were not for some

tatem, immo verum nucleum Christianitatis.] [We admit that under the papacy there is very much of the good that is in Christianity. Nay more, that all the good of Christianity is there, and also that the papacy was the source whence we derived it. In fact, we admit that the papal system has the true sacred Scriptures, true baptism, the true sacrament of the altar, the true keys for the forgiveness of sins, the true office of preaching, the true method of oral instruction, consisting of the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, and the articles of the creed. I go further and say that under the papal system there is a true Christianity, nay more, the true kernel of Christianity.]—Luther, *contra Anabaptistas*, citante Bellarmino, *de Notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv. cap. 16. § penult. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 217. C.] —And, ["Because some men perhaps will think, that we yield more unto our adversaries now than formerly we did, in that we acknowledge the Latin or Western Churches subject to Romish tyranny before God raised up Luther, to have been the true Churches of God, in which a saving profession of the truth in Christ was found, and wherein Luther himself received his Christianity, ordination and power of ministry, I will first show that all our best and most renowned divines did ever acknowledge as much as I have written."]—Field, [*Of the Church*,] Appendix, part iii. ch. 2. [p. 880. ed. Oxford, 1628, vol. iv. p. 520. ed. 1852: and he proceeds, after citing the passages from Luther, Philip du Plessis-Mornay, Calvin, which Laud quotes, to show that the same view was maintained by Bucer, Melanchthon and Beza.]—And, ["For this particular they have not well heeded that charitable profession of zealous Luther, *Nos fatemur*, etc. No man, I trust, will fear that fervent spirit's too much excess of indulgence: under the papacy may be as much good as itself is evil; neither do we censure that Church for what it hath not, but for what it hath. Fundamental truth is like Maronian wine, which if it be mixed with twenty times as much water, holds its strength," etc.]—Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter, *The Old Religion*; [*a Treatise wherein is laid down the true state of the difference between the Reformed and Roman Church, etc.*] ch. 1. [pp. 6, 7. ed. London, 1686.]—And, ["And this is our judgment touching] many [other, both before and after the time of St. Bernard, that] holding Christ the foundation aright, and groaning under the [heavy] burthen of [human traditions, satisfaction, and other] popish trash, [they] by a general repentance [from their errors and lapses, knowne and unknowne] and [by an] assured faith in their Saviour, did find favour with the Lord."—Dr. Geo. Abbot, late Archbishop of Canterbury, *Answer to Hill*; *ad Ration.* 1. § 30. [*i.e.* The reasons which Dr. Hill hath brought for the upholding of Papistry, etc., unmasked, etc., p. 61. ed. Oxford, 1604.]—And, "For mine own part I dare not [hereupon] deny the possibility of their salvation, which have been the chiefest instrument of ours," etc.—Hooker, in his Discourse of Justification, [Sermon ii.] § 17. [*Works*, vol. iii. p. 503. ed. Church and Paget.]—And, "In former times a man might hold the general doctrine of those Churches wherein our fathers lived, and be saved, [though the assertions of some men were damnable]. Now it is clean contrary, touching the present state of the Romish Church; for the general and main doctrine agreed upon in the Council of Trent . . . is damnable. . . . Some certain only are found in it in such degree of orthodoxy, as we may well hope of their salvation."—Field, [*Of the Church*,] book iii. ch. 47. [p. 175. ed. 1852. vol. i. p. 359-60.]—And, "The Latin or Western Church, subject to the Romish tyranny, was a true Church, in which a saving profession of the truth of Christ was found."—Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter, *The Old Religion*, in fin. in his Advertisement to the Reader, p. 202.—And, non pauci Christum fundamentum retinerent, [ab Antichristo licet concussum ac pro virili subversum fuisset. Not a few retained Christ as their foundation-

new matter, was it for some great? Yes, sure, it was. For what greater than salvation? But then, I pray, mark this too, That "might be saved" grants but a possibility,[3] no sure or safe way to salvation. The possibility, I think, cannot be denied—the ignorants especially, because they hold the foundation, and cannot survey the building. And the foundation can deceive no man that rests upon it. But a "secure" way they cannot go, that hold with such corruptions, when they know them. Now, whether it be wisdom, in such a point as salvation is, to forsake a Church, in the which the "ground of salvation is firm" to follow a Church "in which it is but possible one may be saved,"—but very probable he may do worse, if he look not well to the foundation—judge ye. I am sure St. Augustine thought it was not, and "judged it a great sin, in point of salvation, for a man to prefer *incerta certis*, 'uncertainties and naked possibilities before an evident and certain course.'"[4] And Bellarmine is of opinion, and that in the point of

stone, though Antichrist had shaken and overturned it so far as lay in his power.]—Tractat. *de Ecclesia.*—[Phil.] Mornæo [Pless. auctore,] cap. ix. in fin. [p. 442. ed. Le Preux, 1619.]—Inter sordes [autem] istas, ista quæ summo cum periculo expectetur salus, non ipsorum additamentis, sed iis quæ nobiscum habent communia fundamentis est attribuenda. [But amid all that squalor and abuse that salvation, which is awaited with so great a risk, must be put down as due not to their own additions, but to those fundamental principles which they have in common with us.]—Joann. Prideaux, *Lection.* ix. in fin. [*Viginti duæ Lectiones de totidem religionis capitibus se prout publice habebantur Oxoniæ in Vesperiis, etc.* ed. Oxon. 1648. p. 143.]—[Nam] Papa aliquam adhuc religionis formam relinquit: spem vitæ æternæ non tollit: [docet timendum esse Deum: aliquod statuit boni et mali discrimen: Christum verum Deum atque hominem agnoscit; aliquid auctoritatis tribuit Verbo Dei. The pope leaves some form still of religion: he does not take away the hope of life everlasting: he teaches the fear of God: he lays down some distinction between good and evil: he recognises that Christ is true God and man: he allows some authority to the Word of God.]—Calvin. *Instructio adv. Libertinos*, cap. iv. [*Op.*, tom. vii. p. 377. col. 1. ed. Amstelod. 1667.]

[3] Here A. C. gets another snatch, and tells us, "That to grant a possibility of salvation in the Roman Church, is the free confession of an adversary, and therefore is of force against us, and extorted by truth: but to say that salvation is more securely and easily to be had in the Protestant faith, that is but their partial opinion in their own behalf, and of no force, especially with Roman Catholics." I easily believe this latter part, That this, as A. C. and the rest use the matter with their proselytes, shall be of little or no force with Roman Catholics. But it will behove them that it be of force. For let any indifferent man weigh the necessary requisites to salvation, and he shall find this no partial opinion, but very plain and real verity, That the Protestant, living according to his belief, is upon the safer way to heaven. And as for my confession, let them enforce it as far as they can against me, so they observe my limitations; which if they do, A. C. and his fellows will, of all the rest, have but little comfort in such a limited possibility.

[4] Graviter peccaret, in rebus ad salutem animæ pertinentibus, vel eo solo quod certis incerta præponeret. [A man would commit a grave sin, in matters which pertain to the safety of

justification, "That in regard of the uncertainty of our own righteousness, and of the danger of vain-glory, *tutissimum est*, 'it is safest,' to repose our whole trust in the mercy and goodness of God."[5] And, surely, if there be one safer way than another, as he confesses there is, he is no wise man, that in a matter of so great moment will not betake himself to the safest way. And, therefore, even you yourselves, in the point of "condignity of merit," though you write it and preach it boisterously to the people, yet you are content to die—renouncing the condignity of all your own merits, and trust to Christ's. Now, surely, if you will not venture to die as you live, live and believe in time as you mean to die.

II. And one thing more, because you bid "mark this," let me remember to tell you for the benefit of others. Upon this very point—"That we acknowledge an honest ignorant Papist may be saved,"—you, and your like, work upon the advantage of our charity, and your own want of it, to abuse the weak. For thus, I am told, you work upon them:—"You see the Protestants, at least many of them, confess there may be salvation in our Church: We absolutely deny there is salvation in theirs: Therefore it is safer to come to ours, than to stay in theirs;—to be where almost all grant salvation, than where the greater part of the world deny it." This argument is very prevailing with men that cannot weigh it, and with women especially, that are put in fear by violent, though causeless, denying heaven unto them.[6] And some of your

the soul, even on that ground alone that he preferred what was uncertain to what was certain.]—S. Augustin. *de Baptism. cont. Donatist.* lib. i. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 82. D. Migne, ix. 111.]

[5] Sit tertia propositio; Propter incertitudinem propriæ justitiæ, et periculum inanis gloriæ, tutissimum est, fiduciam totam in sola Dei misericordia et benignitate reponere. [Let this be the third proposition: That taking into account the uncertainty of our own righteousness and the danger of vain glory, it is safest to repose our whole trust in the mercy and goodness of God alone.]—Bellarmin. *de Justif.* lib. v. cap. 7. § [20. *Op.*, tom. iv. col. 1095. A.]

[6] And this piece of cunning to affright the weak was in use in Justin Martyr's time. Quosdam scimus etc. ad iracundiam suam Evangelium pertrahentes etc. quibus si potestas ea obtigisset ut nonnullos gehennæ traderent, orbem quoque universum consumpsissent.—[Pseudo-] S. Justin. Martyr. *Epist. ad Zenam et Serenum*, [apud *Op.*, S. Just. Martyr. p. 409. B. *ἤδη δέ τινας ἴσμεν, κατὰ τὸ σαρκικὸν ἐν προκοπῇ γινομένους, ἕλκοντας πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ὀργὴν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ βουλομένους ἐφαρμόζειν τῷ δόγματι τῆς καταφορᾶς αὐτῶν τὰ λόγια τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν· οἷς εἰ ἀποβεβήκει τὸ δύνασθαι ἐν γεέννῃ παραδιδόναι τινὰς, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἂν ὅλος ὑπ' αὐτῶν κατηνάλωτο.* We know some persons who have attained a worldly prominence, and who drag the gospel to suit their own angry passions, and who wish to make the Saviour's words fit their own corrupt doctrine. If to these had fallen the power to hand over anybody to hell, they would have extended that destruction to the whole world.] And here it is: *ad iracundiam suam Ecclesiam pertrahentes*, etc. [Dragging

[CHAPTER XII.] party, since this, have set out a book, called "Charity Mistaken." But besides the "Answer"[7] fully given to it, this alone is sufficient
A. C. p. 65. to confute it: First, that in this, our "charity," whatever yours be, is not "mistaken," unless the charity of the Church herself were mistaken in the case of the Donatists, as shall after appear.[8] Secondly, even "mistaken charity," if such it were, is far better than none at all. And if the "mistaken" be ours, the "none" is yours. Yea, but A. C. tells us, "That this denial of salvation is grounded upon charity, as were the like threats of Christ and the holy Fathers. For there is but one true faith, and one true Church; and out of that there is no salvation. And 'he that
Matt. xviii. 17. will not hear the Church, let him be as a heathen and a publican.'" "Therefore," he says, "it is more charity to forewarn us of the danger by these threats, than to let us run into it through a false security." It is true that there is but one true faith, and but one true Church; but that one, both faith and Church, is the Catholic Christian, not the particular Roman.[9] And this Catholic Christian Church he that will not both hear and obey—yea, and the particular Church in which he lives too, so far as it in necessaries agrees with the Universal—is in as bad condition as a heathen and a publican, and perhaps in some respects worse. And were we in this case, we should thank A. C. for giving us warning of our danger. But it is not so. For he thunders out all these threats, and denial of salvation, because we join not with the Roman Church in all things; as if her corruptions were part of the Catholic faith of Christ. So the whole passage is a mere

the *Church* about to suit their own angry passions.]

[7] ["*Charity Mistaken; with the want thereof Catholicks are unjustly charged, for affirming, as they do with grief, that Protestancy unrepented destroies Salvation.*—Printed with Licence, anno 1630." This work was written by "a certain Jesuit known sometimes by the name of Edward Knott, and sometimes by that of Nicholas Smith, and at other times by Matthew Wilson, which was his true name." (Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, sub. voc. Christopher Potter.) The "Answer fully given to it" was "*Want of Charity justly charged on all such Romanists, as dare (without truth or modesty) affirme that Protestancie destroyeth salvation*," Oxon. 1633, by Dr. Christopher Potter, Provost of Queen's College. "Which book being perused by Dr. Laud, Archb. of Canterbury, he (see Canterburie's *Doome*, pp. 251, 252) caused some matters therein to be omitted in the next impression, London, 1634. But before it was quite printed Knott put out a book, *Mercy and Truth; or Charity maintained by Catholiques*," etc. 1634. It was in answer to Knott that Chillingworth wrote *The Religion of Protestants*. Cf. Laud's *History of his Chancellorship of Oxford*, Wharton's *Remains*, vol. ii. p. 142. Laud's *Works*, ed. 1853. Vol. v., pt. 1, pp. 184 and 185.]

[8] Sect. xxxv. No. 3. [*Vide infra*, p. 337.]

[9] And this is proved by the Creed, in which we profess our belief of the Catholic, not of the Roman Church.

begging of the question, and then threatening upon it, without all ground of reason or charity. In the meantime let A. C. look to himself, that in his false security he run not into the danger and loss of his own salvation, while he would seem to take such care of ours. But though this argument prevails with the weak, yet it is much stronger in the cunning, than the true force of it. For all arguments are very moving, that lay their ground upon the adversaries' confession;[10] especially if it be confessed and avouched to be true. But if you would speak truly, and say, "Many Protestants, indeed, confess there is salvation possible to be attained in the Roman Church; but yet[1] they say, withal, that the errors of that Church are so many (and some so great as weaken the foundation)[11] that it is very hard to go that way to heaven, especially to them that have had the truth manifested," the heart of this argument were utterly broken. Besides, the force of this argument lies upon two things: one directly expressed, the other but as upon the bye.

[1] [yet . . . *caret* Edit. 1686.]

III. That which is expressed is, We and our adversaries consent, that there is salvation to some in the Roman Church. What! would you have us as malicious—at least, as rash—as yourselves are to us, and deny you so much as possibility of salvation? If we should, we might make you in some things strain for a proof; "but we have not so learned Christ," as either to return evil for evil in this heady course, or to deny salvation to some ignorant, silly souls, whose humble peaceable obedience makes them safe among any part of men that profess the foundation, Christ; and therefore seek not to help our cause by denying

[10] "This is a free confession of the adversaries' argument against themselves, and therefore is of force."—A. C., p. 64. But every confession, of adversaries or others, is to be taken with its qualities and conditions: if you leave out or change these, you wrong the confession, and then it is of no force. And so doth A. C here. And though Bellarmine makes "the confession of the adversary" a note of the true Church, *de notis Ecclesiæ*, lib. iv. cap. 16. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 216. D.] Yet in the very beginning, where he lays his ground, § 1, he lays it in a plain fallacy, *a secundum quid ad simpliciter*.

[11] For they are no mean differences that are between us, by Bellarmine's own confession. Agendum est non de rebus levibus, ... sed gravissimis [ac difficillimis] quæstionibus quæ ad ipsa fidei pertinent fundamenta, etc. [The discussion turns not on trivial but on most serious questions which concern the very foundations of the Faith.]—Bellarm in. *præfat. Operibus præfixa*, § 3. And therefore the errors in them, and the corruptions of them, cannot be of small consequence, by your own confession. Yes, by your own indeed. For you, A. C., say full as much, if not more than Bellarmine. Thus: "We Catholics hold all points, in which Protestants differ from us in doctrine of faith, to be fundamental, and necessary to be believed, or at least not denied."—A. C. *Relation of the first Conference*, p. 28.

[CHAPTER XII.]

this comfort to silly Christians, as you most fiercely do, where you can come to work upon them. And this was an old trick of the Donatists. For in the point of baptism, Whether that sacrament was true in the Catholic Church, or in the part of Donatus, they exhorted all to be baptized among them. Why? Because both parts granted, that baptism was true among the Donatists; which that peevish sect most unjustly denied the sound part, as St. Augustine[12] delivers it. I would ask now, Had not the orthodox true baptism among them, because the Donatists denied it injuriously? or should the orthodox, against truth, have denied baptism among the Donatists, either to cry quittance with them, or that their argument might not be the stronger because both parts granted? But, "mark this," how far you run from all common principles of Christian peace, as well as Christian truth, while you deny salvation most unjustly to us, from which you are farther off yourselves. Besides, if this were, or could be made, a concluding argument, I pray, Why do not you believe with us in the point of the Eucharist? For all sides agree in the faith of the Church of England, That in the most Blessed Sacrament, the worthy receiver is, by his faith,[13] made spiritually partaker of the

[12] Esse vero Baptismum apud Donatistas, et illi asserunt, et nos concedimus. [But that the Donatists have Baptism they assert and we grant.]—[S. Augustin.] *de Bapt. cont. Donat.* lib. i. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 81. F. Migne, ix. 111.]

[13] Corpus Christi [datur, accipitur, et] manducatur in cœna, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem quo corpus Christi accipitur, et manducatur in cœna, fides est.—*Eccl. Anglican.* Art. XXVIII. ["The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."]—["These words, as every man may see plainly, make nothing for adoration of the sacrament, but for spiritual reverence to be given to Christ, of them that come to receive the sacrament; by which we are assured, if we come worthily, that we are made partakers of the very body and blood of Christ,] after a spiritual manner, by faith on our behalf, and by the working of the Holy Ghost, on the behalf of Christ."—Fulke, [*on the Rhemish Testament*, etc.] on *1 Cor.* xi. [Annot. 18.] p. 526. [ed. London, 1633.]—Christus Se cum bonis Suis omnibus in [sacra] cœna offert, et nos fide Eum recipimus, etc. [Christ in the sacred Supper offers Himself with all His blessings, and we by Faith receive Him.]—Calvin. *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. xvii. § 5. [*Op.*, tom. v. p. 365. col. 2.]—And, ["'Take therefore that wherein all agree, . . . It is on all sides plainly confessed, first, that this sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, Who thereby imparteth Himself, even His whole entire person as a mystical Head, unto every soul that receiveth Him; and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as a mystical member of Him. . . . Secondly, that to whom the person of Christ is thus communicated, to him He giveth, by the same sacrament, His Holy Spirit to sanctify them. . . . Thirdly, that what merit, force, and virtue soever there is in His sacrificed body and blood, we freely, fully, and wholly have it by this sacrament. Fourthly, that the effect thereof in us, is a real transmutation of our

"true and real Body and Blood of Christ, truly and really,"[14] and of all the benefits of His passion. Your Roman Catholics add a manner of this His presence, "Transubstantiation," which many deny; and the Lutherans, a manner of this presence, "Consubstantiation," which more deny. If this argument be good, then, even for this consent, it is safer communicating with the Church of England than with the Roman or Lutheran; because all agree in this truth, not in any other opinion. Nay, Suarez[15] himself,

souls and bodies from sin to righteousness . . . Christ assisting this heavenly banquet with His personal and true presence, doth, by His own divine power, add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of those consecrated elements, changeth them and maketh them that unto us which otherwise they could not be; that to us they are thereby made such instruments as mystically yet truly, invisibly yet really work our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ, as well in that He is man as God, our participation also in the fruit, grace, and efficacy of His body and blood, whereupon there seemeth a kind of transubstantiation in us," etc.]—Hooker, [*Eccl. Polit.*] Book v. ch. lxvii. p. 176. [§ 7, 11, pp. 378, 381, 382, 383, ed. Bayne.] And say not you the same with us? Spiritualis manducatio, quæ per animam sit, ad Christi carnem in sacramento [existentem] pertingit. [The spiritual eating, which is by means of the soul, reaches to the flesh of Christ in the sacrament.]—Cajetan. *Opusc.* [tom. i.] *de Eucharist.* Tract. ii. cap. 5. [p. 144.]—Ad primum spiritualiter [dici,] id est, invisibiliter, et per virtutem Spiritus Sancti. [In the first place . . . in a spiritual manner, that is not so as to appear to the eyesight, and through the power of the Holy Spirit.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 3. Q[uæst.] lxxv. A[rtic.] 1. ad 1.—Spiritualiter manducandus est per fidem et charitatem. [He must be eaten in a spiritual manner by means of faith and love.]—Tena, in *Hebr.* xiii. *Difficultate* viii. [p. 710. col. 2. *Comment. et Dissert. in Epistol. D. Pauli ad Hebræos*, auctore D. Ludovic. Tena, Accitano, etc. ed. Londin. 1661.]

[14] I would have no man troubled at these words, "truly and really"; for that blessed sacrament, received as it ought to be, doth "truly and really" exhibit and apply the body and the blood of Christ to the receiver. So Bishop White: ["Secondly, the Eucharist is a divine instrument and seal authentical, really applying the body and blood of Christ to every worthy receiver for the remission of sins, and the impetrating of spiritual and worldly blessings,"] in his *Defence against T. W. P.* ed. London, 1617. p. 138. [*The Orthodox Faith and Way to the Church*, etc., by Dr. Francis White, elder brother to Dr. John White, in answer to a Treatise, *White Dyed Black*, written against Dr. John White, etc., p. 157. 2nd edition, London, 1624.]—And, *vere* dari. [It is truly given]:—Calvin. in *1 Cor.* x. 3. [*Op.*, tom. vi. p. 169. col. 1.] And again, Neque enim mortis tantum ac resurrectionis Suæ beneficium nobis offert Christus, sed corpus ipsum in quo passus est, et resurrexit. Concludo, *realiter*, (ut vulgo loquuntur) hoc est, *vere* nobis in cœna dari Christi corpus, ut sit animis nostris in cibum salutarem. [For neither is it the benefit of His death and resurrection only that Christ offers us, but the very body in which He suffered and rose again. I infer that in the Supper Christ's body is given us after a "real" (to use a common expression) that is to say a true manner, that it may be health-giving food for our souls.]—[*Id.*] in *1 Cor.* xi. 24. [*Op.*, tom. vi. p. 182. col. 2.]

[15] [Born at Granada in 1548, a Jesuit, died in 1617; published a book in 1613 against the Oath of Allegiance imposed on English Romanists, which was publicly burnt in London and in Paris.]

[CHAPTER XII.]

and he a very learned adversary, (What say you to this, A. C.? doth truth force this from him?) confesses plainly, "That to believe transubstantiation, is not simply necessary to salvation."[16] And yet he knew well the Church had determined it. And Bellarmine,[17] after an intricate, tedious, and almost inexplicable discourse about an "adductive conversion," a thing which neither divinity nor philosophy ever heard of till then, is at last forced to come to this: "Whatsoever is concerning the manner and forms of speech, *illud tenendum est*, 'this is to be held,' That the conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and the[1] Blood of Christ is substantial, but after a secret and ineffable manner, and not like in all things to any natural conversion whatsoever."[18] Now, if he had left out "conversion," and affirmed only Christ's "real presence" there, after a mysterious, and indeed an ineffable, manner, no man could have spoken better. And therefore, if you will force the argument always to make that the safest way of salvation which differing parties agree on, why do you not yield to the force of the same argument in the belief of the sacrament, one of the most immediate means of salvation, where not only the most, but all, agree; and your own greatest clerks cannot tell what to say to the contrary?

[1] [the . . . *caret* Edit. 1686.]

A. C. p. 64.

IV. I speak here for the force of the argument, which certainly in itself is nothing, though by A. C. made of great account. For he says, It is a confession of adversaries extorted by truth. Just as Petilian the Donatist[19] bragged in the case of baptism.

[16] Hoc [enim] totum pendet ex principiis metaphysicis et philosophicis, et ad fidei doctrinam non est [simpliciter] necessarium. [The whole of this question depends on principles of metaphysic and philosophy, and is not necessary to the teaching of the faith.]—Suarez. in Tert. part. S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.* Quæst. lxxv. Artic. 8.] Disput. 50. § 2. [inter *Op.*, Franc. Suarez, tom. xviii. p. 515. col. 1. ed. Venet. 1747.]

[17] Ex his colligimus. [From this we infer.]—Bellarmin. *de* [*Sacrament.*] *Eucharist.* lib. iii. cap. 18. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 618. B.]

[18] Sed quicquid sit de modis loquendi, illud tenendum est, conversionem panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Christi, esse substantialem, sed arcanam, et ineffabilem, et nullis naturalibus conversionibus per omnia similem.—Bellarmin. *in Recognit. hujus loci*, [*Opp.* præfix. tom. i.]—And, *Vide* [*infra*,] Sect. xxxviii. No. 3.

[19] Sed quia ita magnum firmamentum vanitatis vestræ in hac sententia esse arbitramini, *ut ad hoc tibi terminandam putares epistolam*, quo quasi recentius in animis legentium remaneret, breviter respondeo, etc. [But since you fancy that your folly has so great a support in this line of thought that you find your letter ought to end here in order that the point might remain fresher as it were in the minds of your readers, I give a brief answer.]—S. Augustin. *contra Lit. Petil.* lib. ii. cap. 108. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 296. A. Migne, ix. 345.] And here A. C. ad hoc sibi putavit terminandam collationem: sed frustra ut apparebit, [A. C. thought the comparison should end here; but vainly as will appear in] No. 6. [*vide infra*, p. 353.]

SECTION XXXV.

But in truth, it is nothing; for the syllogism which it frames, is this: "In point of faith and salvation, it is safest for a man to take that way, which the differing parties agree on. But Papists and Protestants, which are the differing parties, agree in this, That there is salvation possible to be found in the Roman Church. Therefore, it is safest for a man to be and continue in the Roman Church." To the minor proposition, then, I observe, this only: That though many learned Protestants grant this, all do not. And then that proposition is not universally true, nor able to sustain the conclusion. For they do not in this all agree; nay, I doubt not but there are some Protestants, which can, and do, as stiffly and as churlishly deny them salvation, as they do us. And A. C. should do well to consider, whether they do it not upon as good reason at least. But for the major proposition; namely, "That in point of faith and salvation, it is safest for a man to take that way which the adversary confesses, or the differing parties agree on." I say, that is no metaphysical principle, but a bare contingent proposition; and, [being indefinitely taken,] may be true or false, as the matter is to which it is applied, [but, being taken universally, is false, and not] able to lead in the conclusion. Now that this proposition, "In point of faith and salvation, it is safest for a man to take that way which the differing parties agree on, or which the adversary confesses," hath no strength in itself, but is sometimes true and sometimes false, as the matter is about which it is conversant, is most evident. First, By reason: because consent of disagreeing parties, is neither rule, nor proof of truth. For Herod and Pilate, disagreeing parties enough, yet agreed against Truth Itself. But truth rather is, or should be, the rule to frame, if not to force, agreement. And secondly, By the two instances before given.[20] For in the instance between the orthodox Church then, and the Donatists, this proposition is most false; for it was a point of faith, and so of salvation, that they were upon—namely, the right use and administration of the sacrament of Baptism. And yet had it been safest to take up that way which the differing parts agreed on, or which the adverse part confessed, men must needs have gone with the Donatists against the Church. And this must fall out as oft as any heretic will cunningly take that way against the Church which the Donatists did, if this principle shall go for current. But in the second instance, concerning the Eucharist, a matter of faith,

[In the Edit. of 1639 the order of the Argument is wrongly printed. The Text is here corrected from Editt. of 1673 and 1686.]

[Inserted from Editt. 1673 and 1686.]

[Editt. 1673 and 1686. In Edit. 1639, "and so of no necessary truth in itself now."]

[20] Sect. xxxv. No. 3. [*vide supra*, p. 337.]

[CHAPTER XII.] and so of salvation too, the same proposition is most true. And the reason is, because here the matter is true—namely, "The true and real participation of the Body and Blood of Christ in that Blessed Sacrament." But in the former the matter was false—namely, That rebaptization was necessary after baptism formally given by the Church. So this proposition—"In point of faith and salvation, it is safest for a man to take that way which the differing parties agree in, or which the adversary confesses," —is, you see, both true and false, as men have cunning to apply it, and as the matter is about which it is conversant; and is, therefore, no proposition able or fit to settle a conclusion in any sober man's mind, till the matter contained under it be well scanned and examined. And yet, as much use as you would make of this proposition to amaze the weak, yourselves dare not stand to it—no, not where the matter is undeniably true, as shall appear in divers particulars beside this of the Eucharist.

V. But before I add any other particular instances, I must tell
A. C. p. 65. you what A. C. says to the two former. For he tells us, "These two are nothing like the present case." Nothing? That is strange indeed. Why, in the first of those cases concerning the Donatists, your proposition is false; and so far from being "safest," that it was no way safe for a man to take that way of belief, and so of salvation, which both parts agreed on. And is this nothing? Nay, is not this full and home to the present case? For the present case is this and no more: "That it is safest taking that way of belief which the differing parties agree on, or which the adversary confesses." And in the second of those cases, concerning the Eucharist, your proposition indeed is true, not by the truth which it hath in itself, metaphysically and in abstract, but only in regard of the matter to which it is applied; yet there you desert your own proposition, where it is true. And is this nothing? Nay, is not this also full and home to the present case, since it appears your proposition is such as yourselves dare not bide by, either when it is true or when it is false? For in the case of baptism administered by the Donatist, the proposition is false, and you dare not bide by it, for truth's sake. And in the case of the Eucharist, the proposition is true, and yet you dare not bide by it, for the Church of Rome's sake. So that Church, with you, cannot err, and yet will not suffer you to maintain truth; which not to do is some degree of error, and that no small one.

VI. Well, A. C. goes on, and gives his reasons why these two instances are nothing like the present case. "For in these cases," saith he, "there are annexed other reasons of certainly known peril of damnable schism and heresy, which we should incur by consenting to the Donatists' denial of true baptism among Catholics: and to the Protestants' denial, or doubting of, the true substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist. But in this case of resolving to live and die in the Catholic Roman Church, there is confessedly no such peril of any damnable heresy, or schism, or any other sin." Here I have many particulars to observe upon A. C., and you shall have them as briefly as I can set them down. SECTION XXXV. A. C. p. 65.

And, first, I take A. C. at his word, that in the case of the Donatist, should it be followed, there would be known peril of damnable schism and heresy, by denying true baptism to be in the orthodox Church. For by this you may see what a sound proposition this is—"That where two parties are dissenting, it is safest believing that in which both parties agree, or which the adversary confesses,"—for here, you may see by the case of the Donatist, is confessed, it may lead a man, that will universally lean to it, into "known" and "damnable schism and heresy." An excellent guide, I promise you, this, is it not? (1.)

Nor, secondly, are these, though A. C. calls them so, "annexed reasons"; for he calls them so but to blanch the matter, as if they fell upon the proposition *ab extra*, "accidentally, and from without"; whereas they are not annexed, or pinned on, but flow naturally out of the proposition itself. For the proposition would seem to be metaphysical, and is appliable indifferently to any common belief of dissenting parties, be the point in difference what it will. Therefore, if there be anything heretical, schismatical, or any way evil, in the point, this proposition, being neither universally nor necessarily true, must needs cast him that relies upon it, upon all these rocks of heresy, schism, or whatever else follows the matter of the proposition. (2.) A. C. p. 65.

Thirdly, A. C. doth extreme ill to join these cases of the Donatists for baptism, and the Protestant for the Eucharist, together, as he doth. For this proposition, in the first, concerning the Donatists, leads a man, as is confessed by himself, into "known and damnable schism and heresy": but by A. C.'s good leave, the latter, concerning the Protestants and the Eucharist, nothing so. For I hope A. C. dare not say, that to believe the (3.) A. C. p. 66.

[CHAPTER XII.] true substantial presence of Christ is either "known or damnable schism or heresy." Now, as many and as learned Protestants[21] believe and maintain this, as do believe possibility of salvation,[22] as before is limited, in the Roman Church: therefore they in that not guilty of either "known or damnable schism, or heresy," though the Donatists were of both.

(4.) A. C. p. 66. Fourthly, whereas he imposes upon the Protestants the "denial or doubting of the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist," he is a great deal more bold than true in that also. For, understand them right, and they certainly neither deny nor doubt it; for, as for the Lutherans, as they are commonly called, their very opinion of consubstantiation makes it known to the world, that they neither deny nor doubt of His true and real presence there. And they are Protestants. And for the Calvinists, if they might be rightly understood, they also maintain a most true and real presence, though they cannot permit their judgment to be transubstantiated. And they are Protestants too. And this is so known a truth that Bellarmine confesses it; for he saith, "Protestants do often grant, that the true and real body of Christ is in the Eucharist"; but he adds, "That they never say, so far as he hath read, that it is there truly and really, unless they speak of the supper which shall be in heaven."[23] Well: first, if

[21] Cæterum his absurditatibus sublatis, quicquid (ad exprimendam veram *substantialemque* corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub sacris Cœnæ symbolis fidelibus exhibetur), facere potest, *libenter recipio*: [atque ita ut non imaginatione duntaxat aut mentis intelligentia percipere, sed ut re ipsa frui in alimentum vitæ æternæ intelligantur. Yet when these absurdities have been cleared away, I willingly accept all possible means for drawing out the true and "substantial" communion of the body and blood of the Lord which is tendered to the faithful under the sacred symbols of the Supper: and in this sense—not that they be understood to apprehend it by imagination merely or an intellectual act of the mind, but to enjoy the thing itself, as nourishing food for everlasting life.]—Calvin. *Instit.* lib. iv. cap. 17. § 19. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 370.]—[Dico igitur,] in Cœnæ mysterio, per symbola panis et vini Christus vere nobis exhiberi; participes substantiæ Ejus facti. [I say therefore; in the mystery of the Supper by means of the symbols of bread and wine Christ is truly presented to us: we are made sharers in His substance.]—*Ibid.* § 11. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 367.]

[22] Sect. xxxv. No. 3. [*ubi sup.* p. 337.]

[23] Quinto dicit, Sacramentarii sæpe dicut, *reale* corpus Christi in cœna adesse, sed *realiter* adesse nunquam dicunt, quod legerim: nisi forte loquantur de cœna, quæ fit in cœlo. [Fifthly he says, the "Sacramentarians" often say that the real body of Christ is present in the Supper; but, that He is present in a real manner, they never say as far as I have read; unless perhaps they speak of the Supper which takes place in heaven.]—Bellarmin. *de* [*Sacrament.*] *Eucharist.* lib. i. cap. ii. § [6. *Op.*, tom. iii. col. 395. B.] And that he means to brand Protestants under the name of *Sacramentarii*, is plain. For he says the Council of Trent opposed this word *realiter*,

SECTION XXXV.

A. C. p. 65.

they grant that the true and real Body of Christ is in that Blessed Sacrament, as Bellarmine confesses they do, and it is most true, then A. C. is false, who charges all the Protestants with denial or doubtfulness in this point. And, secondly, Bellarmine himself also shows here his ignorance, or his malice;—ignorance, if he knew it not; malice, if he would not know it. For the Calvinists, at least they which follow Calvin himself, do not only believe that the true and real Body of Christ is received in the Eucharist, but that it is there, and that we partake of it, *vere et realiter*, which are Calvin's[24] own words; and yet Bellarmine boldly affirms, that, to his reading, "no one Protestant did ever affirm it." And I, for my part, cannot believe but Bellarmine had read Calvin, and very carefully, he doth so frequently and so mainly oppose him. Nor can that place by any art be shifted, or by any violence wrested from Calvin's true meaning of the "Presence of Christ in and at the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist," to any "supper in heaven" whatsoever. But most manifest it is, that *quod legerim*, "for aught I have read," will not serve Bellarmine to excuse him. For he himself, but in the very chapter going before,[25] quotes four places out of Calvin, in which he says expressly, That we receive in the sacrament the Body and the Blood of Christ, *vere*, "truly." So Calvin says it four times, and Bellarmine quotes the places; and yet he says in the very next chapter, That never any Protestant said so, to his reading. And for the Church of England, nothing is more plain, than that it believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist;[26] unless A. C. can

figmento Calvinistico, to the Calvinistical figment.—*Ibid.*

[24] Calvin. in. *1 Cor.* x. 3. *vere*, etc. et in *1 Cor.* xi. 24. *realiter*. *Vide supra*, No. 3. [p. 339. note 14.]

[25] Secundo docet [(sc. Calvinus,) symbola et corpus Christi, licet loco inter se plurimum distent, tamen conjuncta esse, non solum ratione signi, quia unum est signum alterius, sed etiam, quia cum signo Deus nobis vere exhibet ipsum verum Christi corpus et sanguinem, quo animæ nostræ vere alantur in vitam æternam. Secondly, Calvin teaches that these symbols and the body of Christ, though in the matter of space they are very far apart from each other, yet are united not merely in virtue of the sign, because one is a sign of the other; but also because together with the sign God truly presents to us the very true body and blood of Christ, by which our souls may be truly nourished so as to attain life everlasting.]—Bellarmin. *de* [*Sacrament.*] *Eucharist.* lib. i. cap. 1. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 391. C.]

[26] "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper (of the Lord,) only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten, is faith."—Eccl. Ang. Art. XXVIII. So here is the manner of transubstantiation denied, but the body of Christ twice affirmed. And in the Prayer before Consecration, thus: "Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, etc." —And again, in the second Prayer or

[CHAPTER XII.]

make a Body no Body, and Blood no Blood—as perhaps he can by transubstantiation,—as well as bread no bread, and wine no wine. And the Church of England is Protestant too. So Protestants of all sorts maintain a true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and then, where is any known or damnable heresy here? As for the learned of those zealous men that died in this cause in Queen Mary's days, they denied not the real presence simply taken, but as their opposites forced transubstantiation upon them, as if that and the real presence had been all one. Whereas, all the ancient Christians ever believed the one, and none but modern and superstitious Christians believe the other—if they do believe it; for I, for my part, doubt they do not. And as for the unlearned, in those times and all times, their zeal (they holding the foundation) may eat out of their ignorances, and leave them safe. Now, that the learned Protestants in Queen Mary's days did not deny—nay, did maintain—the real presence, will manifestly appear. For when the commissioners obtruded to J[ohn] Frith,[27] the presence of Christ's natural body in the sacrament; and that without all figure or similitude, J[ohn] Frith acknowledges: "[In that it is received it is Christ's body, signifying that as verily] as the outward man received the sacrament with his [teeth and] mouth, so verily doth the inward man [through faith] receive Christ's Body [and fruit of His passion, and is as sure of it as of the bread which he eateth."][28] And he adds, "That neither side ought to make it a necessary article of [the] faith, but leave it indifferent."[29] Nay, Archbishop Cranmer[30] comes more plainly and more home to it than Frith: "For if you understand," saith he, "by this word 'really,' *reipsa*,[31] that is in very deed and effectually; so Christ, by the grace and efficacy of His passion, is in deed and truly present [to all His

Thanksgiving after Consecration, thus: "We give Thee thanks, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ," etc. [See Note at end of Chapter.]

[27] [John Frith, one of the earliest teachers at Wolsey's New College of Christ Church; an associate and helper of Tyndale; attacked Sir T. More's defence of purgatory; and wrote on the Eucharist; seized in England c. 1531; condemned before Bishop Gardiner and others, and burnt at Smithfield on July 4, 1533.]

[28] John Foxe, in *Acts and Monuments of Martyrs*, etc. vol. ii. p 943. ed. London, 1597. [and vol. ii. p. 253. col. 2. ed. London, 1684.]

[29] Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. [*ibid.* vol. ii. p. 254.]

[30] [Archbishop of Canterbury, 1533 to 1556; burnt at Oxford, March 21, 1556.]

[31] Cranmer apud Foxe, *ibid.* p. 1301. [*Acts and Monuments*, vol. iii. pp. 38, 39.]

true and holy members.] But if you understand by this word 'really' *corporaliter*,[82] 'corporally,' in His natural and organical

[82] [Cranmer's words are: ". . . corporally: so that by the body of Christ is understood a natural body and organical, so the first proposition doth vary not only from the usual speech and phrase of Scripture, but also is clean contrary to the holy word of God, and Christian profession."—The "first proposition" to which he alludes was: "In the sacrament of the altar is the natural Body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also His Blood present really under the forms of bread and wine, by virtue of God's word pronounced by the priest"] —I say *corporaliter*, corporally; for so Bellarmine hath it expressly: Sed tota [difficultas est, an corporaliter, realiter, proprie, sumatur sanguis et caro: an solum significative et spiritualiter.] Quod autem corporaliter et proprie, (sumatur sanguis et caro,) probari potest omnibus argumentis, [quibus supra probavimus proprie esse intelligenda illa verba institutionis: Hoc est corpus, etc.] [But the whole difficulty is whether the Blood and Flesh is received in a corporal and real manner, in the strict and proper sense, or only in a symbolical and spiritual manner. But that the Blood and Flesh are received corporally and in strict and proper sense can be proved by all the arguments by which we have proved that those words of institution, "This is my Body," etc., are to be understood in their strict and proper sense.]—Bellarmin. *de Sacrament. Eucharist.* lib. i. cap. 12. § 6. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 448. A.] And I must be bold to tell you more then, That this is the doctrine of the Church of Rome. For I must tell you too, that Bellarmine here contradicts himself. For he that tells us here, that it can be proved by many arguments, that we receive the flesh and the blood of Christ in the eucharist *corporaliter*, said as expressly before, (had he remembered it,) that though Christ be in this Blessed Sacrament vere et realiter, yet saith he: Tertia regula: [adverbia, quæ dicunt modum existendi corporalem, non dicuntur de Christo in Eucharistia, licet dicantur de Ipso, ut in cœlo residet: alia vero nihil prohibet dici. Ratio est, quia . . . non habet Christus in Eucharistia modum existendi corporum, sed potius spirituum, cum sit totus in qualibet parte. Itaque dicemus, Christum esse in Eucharistia vere, realiter, substantialiter, ut Concilium (Tridentinum) recte loquitur, sed] non dicemus *corporaliter*, *i.e.* eo modo, quo suapte natura existunt corpora, [nec sensibiliter, mobiliter, etc. This is the third rule: adverbs which describe a corporal manner of being are not spoken of Christ in the Eucharist, though they are spoken of Him when He resides in heaven; but other expressions may be used. The reason is that Christ has not in the Eucharist the mode of being which bodies have, but rather the mode of being which spirits have; since He is all in each part of the Eucharist. And so we will say that Christ is in the Eucharist, actually, really, substantially, as the Council of Trent rightly phrases it; but we will not say *corporally*, *i.e.* in that manner in which of their own nature bodies exist, nor sensibly, moveably, etc.]—Bellarmin. *de Sacrament. Eucharist.* lib. i. cap. 2. § 12. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 396. D.] So, Bellarmine here is in a notorious contradiction; or else it will follow plainly out of him, That Christ in the sacrament is existent one way and received another, which is a gross absurdity. And that *corporaliter* was the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and meant by transubstantiation, is farther plain in the book called, *The Institution of a Christian Man*, set forth by the bishops in convocation in Henry the Eighth's time. An. 1534. Cap. "Of the sacrament of the altar." The words are: "Under the form and figure of bread and wine, the very body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, etc., exhibited and received," etc. And Aquinas expresses it thus: Quia tamen substantia corporis Christi realiter non dividitur a sua quantitate dimensiva, et ab aliis accidentibus, inde est, quod ex vi realis concomitantiæ est in hoc sacramento tota quantitas dimensiva corporis Christi, et omnia accidentia ejus. [However, the substance of Christ's body is not really divided from its quantity and from the other accidents.

[CHAPTER XII.] Body, under the forms of bread and wine, it is contrary to the holy word of God." And so likewise Bishop Ridley; nay, Bishop Ridley adds yet farther, and speaks so fully to this point, as I think no man can add to his expression; and it is well if some Protestants except not against it. "Both you and I," saith he, "agree herein: That in the sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in modo*, 'in the way and manner of being': we confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there. I [being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded,] confess Christ's natural Body to be in the sacrament [indeed] by spirit and grace, etc. You make a grosser kind of being, enclosing a natural, [a lively, and a moving] Body, under the shape and form of bread and wine."[33] So far, and more, Bishop Ridley. And Archbishop Cranmer[34] confesses that he was indeed of another opinion, and inclining to that of Zuinglius, till Bishop Ridley convinced his judgment, and settled him in this point. And for Calvin,[35] he

It is agreed that by the force of its real co-existence (concomitancy) there is in this Sacrament the whole measurable quantity of Christ's body and all its accidents.]—Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 3. Q[uæst.] lxxvi. A[rtic.] 4. in conclus. [Migne, iv. 737.]

[33] Apud Foxe, *ibid.* p. 1598. [*Acts and Monuments*, vol. iii. p. 420. col. 2.]

[34] ["I grant that then (when I helped to burn Lambert the sacramentary,) I believed otherwise than I do now, and so I did, until my Lord of London, Doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors drew me quite from my opinion."—Cranmer,] apud Foxe, *ibid.* p. 1703. [*Acts and Monuments*, vol. iii. p. 550. col. 2. ed. London, 1684.]

[35] [Ergo] tantum de modo quæstio est: [quia Christum ipsi in pane locant, nobis autem non ducimus fas esse Eum e cœlo detrahere . . . Tantum] facessat calumnia [illa,] auferri Christum a Sua cœna, [nisi sub panis integumento lateat.] [So the dispute is only about the manner or mode: since they themselves place Christ in the bread, while we do not think we have the right to drag Him down from Heaven. . . . Only away with that false charge that Christ is being expelled from His Supper if He be not concealed under the covering of bread.]—Calvin. *Institut.* lib. iv. cap. 17. § 31. [*Op.*, tom. viii. p. 375.] —[Itaque] Veritatem Dei, in qua acquiescere tuto licet, [hic] sine controversia amplector. Pronunciat Ille carnem suam esse animæ meæ cibum, sanguinem esse potum. Talibus alimentis animam Illi meam pascendam offero. In sacra [Sua] cœna jubet me sub symbolis panis ac vini corpus ac sanguinem Suum sumere, manducare ac bibere: nihil dubito, quin et Ipse vere porrigat, et ego recipiam. [I embrace without any disputing the Truth of God with which one may safely agree. He declares that His Flesh is my soul's food and His Blood its drink. I offer to Him my soul to be fed with such nourishments. In His sacred Supper He bids me under the symbols of bread and wine take His Body and His Blood, eat and drink it: I nothing doubt but that both He Himself offers it and I receive it.]—Calvin. *ibid.* § 32.

comes no whit short of these against the calumny of the Romanists on that behalf. Now, after all this, with what face can A. C. say, as he doth, That Protestants deny or doubt of the "true and real presence of Christ in the sacrament," I cannot well tell, or am unwilling to utter.

SECTION XXXV.

Fifthly, whereas it is added by A. C. "That in this present case there is no peril of any damnable heresy, schism, or any other sin, in resolving to live and die in the Roman Church"; that is not so neither: for he that lives in the Roman Church with such a resolution, is presumed to believe as that Church believes; and he that doth so, I will not say is as guilty, but guilty he is, more or less, of the schism which that Church first caused by her corruptions, and now continues by them and her power together; and of all her damnable opinions too, in point of misbelief—though perhaps A. C. will not have them called heresies, unless they have been condemned in some General Council; and of all other sins also, which the doctrine and misbelief of that Church leads him into. And mark it, I pray. For it is one thing to live in a schismatical Church, and not communicate with it in the schism, or in any false worship that attends it. For so Elias lived among the ten tribes, and was not schismatical; and after him Elisæus. But then neither of them either countenanced the schism, or worshipped the calves in Dan or in Bethel. And so also, beside these prophets, did those thousands live in a schismatical Church, yet "never bowed their knee to Baal." But it is quite another thing to live in a schismatical Church, and communicate with it in the schism, and in all the superstitions and corruptions which that Church teaches—nay, to live and die in them. For certainly here no man can so live in a schismatical Church; but if he be of capacity enough and understand it, he must needs be a formal schismatic, or an involved one if he understand it not. And in this case, the Church of Rome is either far worse or more cruel than the Church of Israel, even under Ahab and Jezebel, was. The synagogue, indeed, was corrupted a long time, and in a great degree; but I do not find that this doctrine, "You must sacrifice in the high places," or this, "You may not go and worship at the one altar in Jerusalem," was either taught by the priests, or maintained by the prophets, or enjoined the people by the Sanhedrim. Nay, can you show me when any Jew, living there devoutly according to the law, was ever punished for omitting the one of these, or doing the other? But the Church

(5.) A. C. p. 66.

1 Kings xvii. 2 Kings iii.

1 Kings xix. 18.

[CHAPTER XII.]

of Rome hath solemnly decreed her errors; and, erring, hath yet decreed withal, "That she cannot err"; and imposed upon learned men disputed and improbable opinions—transubstantiation, purgatory, and forbearance of the cup in the blessed Eucharist, even against the express command of our Saviour; and that for articles of faith. And to keep off disobedience, whatever the corruption be, she hath bound up her decrees upon pain of excommunication, and all that follows upon it. Nay, this is not enough, unless the faggot be kindled to light them the way. This, then, may be enough for us to leave Rome, though the old prophet forsook not Israel. And therefore in this present case there is peril, great peril, of damnable both schism and heresy and other sin, by living and dying in the Roman faith, tainted with so many superstitions, as at this day it is, and their tyranny to boot. So that here I may answer A. C. just as St. Augustine[36] answered Petilian the Donatist, in the forenamed case of baptism. For when Petilian pleaded the concession of his adversaries, "That baptism, as the Donatists administered it, was good and lawful; and thence inferred," just as the Jesuit doth against me, "that it was better for men to join with his congregation than with the Church"; St. Augustine

1 Kings xiii. 11.

[36] Petilianus dixit: Venite [ergo] ad ecclesiam populi, et aufugite traditores, (ita Orthodoxos tum appellavit) si cum iisdem perire non vultis. Nam ut facile cognoscatis, quod [cum] ipsi sint rei, de fide nostra optime judicent: ego illorum infectos baptizo: illi meos, quod absit, recipiunt baptizatos; quæ omnino non facerent, si in baptismo nostro culpas aliquas agnovissent. Videte ergo, quod damus, quam sit sanctum, quod destruere metuit sacrilegus inimicus. S. August. respondit. . . . Sic approbamus in hæreticis baptismum, non hæreticorum, sed Christi, sicut in fornicatoribus . . . idololatris, veneficis . . . approbamus baptismum, non eorum, sed Christi. Omnes enim isti, inter quos et hæretici [positi] sunt, sicut dicit Apostolus: Regnum Dei non possidebunt, etc. [Petilianus said: Come to the people's Church and fly from traitors (or traditors, *i.e.* those who gave up the sacred Books in the persecutions) (that was the name he then gave to the orthodox) unless you are desirous of perishing with them. For here is an easy way by which you may know that they themselves are guilty, and that they have an excellent opinion of our faith: I baptise those of them that have undergone the baptismal ceremony: while they receive (may such a thing never happen, I pray) members of my flock as baptised: and surely they would never do that if they had marked any flaws in our baptism. See then how holy is the gift we offer, so holy that our sacrilegious foes fear to upset it. St. Augustine replied, We do indeed approve the baptism of heretics, but this not in so far as it is the baptism of heretics, but as it is the baptism of Christ: just as we approve baptism of adulterers, idolaters, witches, etc., and yet not in so far as it is theirs, but as it is Christ's baptism. For all such people, amongst whom also are included heretics, as the Apostle says, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.]—S. Augustin. *cont. Lit. Petiliani*, lib. ii. cap. 108. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 295. F. Migne, ix. 345.]

answers: "We do indeed approve among heretics baptism, but so, not as it is the baptism of heretics, but as it is the baptism of Christ; just as we approve the baptism of adulterers, idolaters, witches, and yet not as it is theirs, but as it is Christ's baptism. For none of these, for all their baptism, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And the Apostle reckons heretics among them." And again afterwards: "It is not therefore yours," saith St. Augustine, "which we fear to destroy, but Christ's; which, even among the sacrilegious, is of and in itself holy."[37] Now you shall see how full this comes home to our Petilianist A. C., for he is one of the contractors of the Church of Christ to Rome, as the Donatists confined it to Africa. And he cries out, "That a possibility of salvation is a free confession of the adversaries, and is of force against them, and to be thought extorted from them by force of truth itself." I answer: I do indeed, for my part, leaving other men free to their own judgment, acknowledge a possibility of salvation in the Roman Church. But so as that, which I grant to Romanists, is not as they are Romanists, but as they are Christians; that is, as they believe the Creed, and hold the foundation Christ Himself, not as they associate themselves wittingly and knowingly to the gross superstitions of the Romish Church. Nor do I fear to destroy *quod ipsorum est*, "that which is theirs"; but yet I dare not proceed so roughly as, with theirs, or for theirs, to deny or weaken the foundation, which is Christ's, even among them; and which is and remains holy, even in the midst of their superstitions. And I am willing to hope there are many among them, which keep within that Church, and yet wish the superstitions abolished which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their errors in what they know not; and which hold the foundation firm, and live accordingly, and which would have all things amended that are amiss, were it in their power. And to such I dare not deny a "possibility of salvation," for that which is Christ's in them, though they hazard themselves extremely by keeping so close to that, which is superstition, and, in the case of images, comes too near idolatry. Nor can A. C. shift this off by adding, "living and dying in the Roman Church." For this "living and dying in the Roman

SECTION XXXV.

Gal. v. 19, 20, 21.

A. C. pp. 64, 65.

A. C. p. 66.

[37] Non ergo vestrum est quod destruere metuimus, sed Christi: quod et in sacrilegis per se sanctum est. [It is not therefore yours which we fear to destroy, but Christ's; which, even in the sacrilegious, is of and in itself holy.]—S. Augustin. *ibid.* [col. 296. E. Migne, ix. 346.]

[CHAPTER XII.] Church," as is before expressed, cannot take away the possibility of salvation from them which believe and repent of whatsoever is error or sin in them, be it sin known to them or be it not. But then perhaps A. C. will reply, that if this be so, I must then maintain, that a Donatist also, living and dying in schism, might be saved. To which I answer two ways. First, that a plain honest Donatist, having, as is confessed, true baptism, and holding the foundation—as, for aught I know, the Donatists did[38]

[38] For though Prateolus will make Donatus, and from him the Donatists, to be guilty of an impious heresy (I doubt he means Arianism, though he name it not,) in making the Son of God less than the Father, and the Holy Ghost less than the Son; lib. iv. *Hæres.* 14. [p. 147. ed. Colon. 1569.] yet these things are most manifest out of St. Augustine concerning them, who lived with them, both in time and place, and understood them and their tenets far better than Prateolus could. And first, St. Augustine tells us concerning them: Ariani, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, diversas substantias esse dicunt: Donatistæ autem unam Trinitatis substantiam confitentur. [The Arians say that the substances of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit are different, while the Donatists confess but one substance of the Trinity.] So they are no Arians. Secondly: [Et] si aliqui ipsorum minorem Filium esse dixerunt quam Pater est; ejusdem tamen substantiæ non negarunt. [If some of them have asserted the inferiority of the Son to the Father, yet they have not denied that they are of the same substance.] But this is but *si aliqui*, "if any": so it was doubtful, this too, though Prateolus delivers it positively. Thirdly: Plurimi vero in eis hoc se dicunt, omnino credere de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto, quod Catholica credit Ecclesia. Nec ipsa cum illis vertitur quæstio; sed de sola communione infeliciter litigant, etc. [Indeed, very many among them say that they fully believe concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit precisely what the Catholic Church believes. Nor is that question itself debated with them; but their unhappy disputings are concerned only about union with the Church.] *De sola*, "only about the union with the Church." Therefore they erred not in fundamental points of faith. And, lastly, all that can further be said against them, is, that some of them, to win the Goths to them, when they were powerful, said: Hoc se credere quod et ille credunt. [That they themselves believed what they also, the Goths, believed.] Now the Goths, for the most, were Arians. But then, saith St. Augustine, they were but *nonnulli*, "some of them." And of this some it was no more certain, than *sicut audivimus*, "as we have heard"; St. Augustine knew it not. And then if it were true of some, yet majorum suorum auctoritate convincuntur; quia nec Donatus ipse sic credidisse asseritur, de cujus parte se esse gloriantur. [They are convicted by the authority of their own leaders; because not even of Donatus himself is it asserted that he held this belief; and they boast themselves on being of his following.]—S. Augustin. Epist. 1. [aliter, de Correctione Donatistarum lib. seu Epist. clxxxv. ad Bonifacium, *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 643. D.] Where Prateolus is again deceived; for he says expressly, that Donatus affirmed the Son to be less than the Father: Impius ille asserebat, etc. But then indeed—and which perchance deceived Prateolus—beside Donatus the founder of this heresy, there was another Donatus, who succeeded Majorinus at Carthage, and he was guilty of the heresy which Prateolus mentions: Exstant scripta ejus, ubi apparet [eum etiam non catholicam de Trinitate habuisse sententiam, sed quamvis ejusdem substantiæ, minorem tamen Patre Filium, et minorem Filio putasse Sp. Sanctum. There are extant writings of his in which it is plain that he too did not hold the Catholic faith concerning the Trinity, but thought that though they were of the same sub-

—and repenting of whatever was sin in him, and would have repented of the schism had it been known to him, might be saved. Secondly, That in this particular the Romanist and the Donatist differ much; and that therefore it is not of necessary consequence, that if a Romanist now, upon the conditions before expressed, may be saved, therefore a Donatist heretofore might. For, in regard of the schism, the Donatist was in one respect worse, and in greater danger of damnation, than the Romanist now is; and in another respect better, and in less danger. The Donatist was in greater danger of damnation, if you consider the schism itself then; for they brake from the orthodox Church without any cause given them. And here it doth not follow, If the Romanist have "a possibility of salvation," therefore a Donatist hath. But if you consider the cause of the schism now, then the Donatist was in less danger of damnation than the Romanist is; because the Church of Rome gave the first and the greatest cause of the schism, as is proved before.[39] And therefore here it doth not follow, that if a Donatist have possibility of salvation, therefore a Romanist hath; for a lesser offender may have that possibility of safety, which a greater hath not.

SECTION XXXV.

And last of all: whereas A. C. adds, that "confessedly there is no such peril"; that is a most loud untruth, and an ingenuous man would never have said it. For in the same place,[40] where I grant a possibility of salvation in the Roman Church, I presently add, that it is no secure way, in regard of Roman corruptions. And A. C. cannot plead for himself that he either knew not this, or that he overlooked it; for himself disputes against it as strongly as he can. What modesty or truth call you this? For he that confesses a "possibility of salvation," doth not thereby confess "no peril of damnation" in the same way. Yea, but if some "Protestants should say there is peril of damnation to live and

(6.) A. C. p. 66.

stance, yet the Son was inferior to the Father, and the Holy Spirit to the Son]—as St. Augustine confesses, *lib. de Hæresibus*, [*ad Quodvultdeum*,] Hæres. lxix. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 21. F.] But then St. Augustine adds there also: [Verum in hunc, quem de Trinitate habuit, ejus errorem Donatistarum multitudo intenta non fuit;] nec facile in eis quisquam, [qui hoc illum sensisse noverit, invenitur,]—[But upon this erroneous belief which he held concerning the Trinity, the Donatists at large were not at all set; and it is not an easy matter to find among them anyone who knows that he held this opinion]—that scarce any of the Donatists did so much as know, that this Donatus held that opinion, much less did they believe it themselves.—S. Aug. *Ibid.*

[39] Sect. xxi. No. 4. etc. [*vide supra*, p. 154.]

[40] Sect. xxxv. No. 1, 2. [*vide supra*, pp. 332—337.]

[CHAPTER XII.]

A. C. p. 66.

die in the Roman faith, their saying is nothing in comparison of the number or worth of those that say there is none." So A. C. again: "And beside, they which say it are contradicted by their own more learned brethren." Here A. C. speaks very confusedly. But whether he speak of Protestants or Romanists, or mixes both, the matter is not great. For as for the number and worth of men, they are no necessary concluders for truth. Not number; for who would be judged by the many? The time was when the Arians were too many for the orthodox.[41] Not worth simply; for

[41] Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est. [The whole world groaned aloud and wondered to find itself Arian.]—S. Hier. *advers. Luciferian.* post medium, tom. ii. [Altercatio Luciferiani et Orthodoxi, *Op.*, tom. iv. part ii. col. 300. ed. Benedict.]—Arianorum venenum, non jam portiunculam quandam, sed pene orbem totum contaminaverat, adeo ut prope cunctis Latini Sermonis Episcopis, partim vi partim fraude deceptis, caligo quædam mentibus offunderetur, etc. [It was no longer a certain small part that the poisonous doctrine of the Arians had contaminated, but almost the whole world, and to such an extent that when nearly all the Latin-speaking bishops had been ensnared partly by force and partly by deceit, a sort of mist was spread over men's minds.]—Vin. Lir. *cont. Hæres.* cap. vi. [in init. p. 9.]—Ecclesia non parietibus consistit, sed in dogmatum veritate. Ecclesia ibi est, ubi fides vera est. Cæterum ante annos quindecim, aut viginti, parietes omnes hic ecclesiarum hæretici (de Arianis et aliis hæreticis loquitur) possidebant . . . Ecclesia autem [vera] illic erat, ubi vera fides erat. [The existence of the Church depends not upon the possession of walls, but in the truth of its beliefs. The Church is there where the true faith is. But some fifteen or twenty years ago heretics (he is speaking of the Arians and other heretics) were in possession of all the walls of the churches here . . . but the true Church was there where true faith was to be found.]—[Pseudo-] S. Hieronym. [*Breviar. in Psalter.*] in *Ps.* cxxxiii. [*Op.*, tom. ii. in Appendic. col. 472.] —*Constantius.* Tantane orbis terræ pars, Liberi, in te residet, ut tu solus homini impio (de Athanasio loquitur) subsidio venire, et pacem orbis ac mundi totius dirimere audeas? *Liberius.* Esto quod ego solus sim, non tamen propterea causa fidei fit inferior, nam olim tres solum erant reperti, qui regis mandato resisterent, etc. [ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπε Λιβερίῳ· πόσον εἰ μέρος τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὅτι σὺ μόνος συναίρῃ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀνοσίῳ, καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου λύεις; Λιβέριος. οὐ διὰ τὸ εἶναί με μόνον, ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἐλαττοῦται λόγος, καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν, τρεῖς μόνοι εὑρίσκονται ἀντιστάντες προστάξει.]—[The Emperor (*Constantius*) said to Liberius, Do you, Liberius, represent so great a portion of the world that you dare alone to take the side of an impious fellow (he means Athanasius), and to injure the peace of the earth and the whole universe? *Liberius* answered, Granted that I am alone, yet not on that account is the cause of the faith weakened; for on a former occasion three only were found to resist a (king's) decree.]—Theodoret. *Ecclesiast. Histor.* lib. ii. cap. 16. Dialogo inter Constant. Imp. et Liberium papam. [Apud *Eccles. Hist. Scriptor.* ed. Reading. tom. iii. p. 94.] So that pope did not think multitude any great note of the true Church.—Ubi sunt, etc. qui Ecclesiam multitudine definiunt, et parvum gregem aspernantur, etc. [ποῦ ποτε εἰσὶν, οἱ τὴν πενίαν ἡμῖν ὀνειδίζοντες, καὶ τὸν πλοῦτον κομπάζοντες; οἱ πλήθει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὁρίζοντες, καὶ τὸ βραχὺ διαπτύοντες ποίμνιον; Where are they who reproach us with our poverty, and who brag of their wealth; whose definition of the Church has to do with mere numbers, and who scorn the little flock?]—S. Greg. Nazianzen. *Orat.* [xxxiii. olim] xxv. in init. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 603. A.] Nay, the Arians were grown to that boldness, that they

SECTION XXXV.

that once misled, is of all other the greatest misleader.[42] And yet God forbid, that to worth weaker men should not yield in difficult and perplexed questions, yet so, as that when "matters fundamental in the faith" come in question, they finally rest upon a higher and clearer certainty than can be found in either number or weight of men. Besides, if you mean your own party, you have not yet proved your party more worthy for life or learning than the Protestants. Prove that first, and then it will be time to tell you how worthy many of your popes have been for either life or learning. As for the rest, you may blush to say it. For all Protestants unanimously agree in this, "That there is great peril of damnation for any man to live and die in the Roman persuasion." And you are not able to produce any one Protestant that ever said the contrary. And therefore that is a most notorious slander, where you say, that they which affirm this peril of damnation are contradicted by their own more learned brethren. A. C. p. 66.

VII. And thus having cleared the way against the exceptions of A. C. to the two former instances, I will now proceed,[43] as I promised, to make this farther appear, that A. C. and his fellows dare not stand to that ground which is here laid down—namely,

objected to the Catholics of that time *paucitatem*, the thinness of their number.
[*καὶ τοῦτο δ' ἦν θρύλλημα τῶν ἐναντίων, μηδ' ἂν πυλῶσι τὸν λεὼν ἐξαρκέσαι, τὸν πρὶν μερισθέν θ', ἡνίκ' ἡμεν ἐνδεεῖς.* And this was our adversaries' common talk that the folk who belonged to our side formerly when we were in distress, were not sufficient even to fill the porches.]—S. Greg. Nazianz. *Carm. de vita sua*, [Carm. xi. 1. 1495.] p. 24. ed. Paris. 1611. [*Op.*, tom. ii. p. 752. ed. Benedict.]—Quum ejecti tamen essent de civitatibus, jactabant in desertis suis synagogis illud: Multi vocati, pauci electi. [*καὶ γράμμασι τοὺς οἰκείους παρεμυθοῦντο, παραινοῦντες μὴ ἄχθεσθαι ἐφ' οἷς πολλοὶ καταλιπόντες αὐτοὺς, τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ προσέθεντο· πολλοὺς γὰρ εἶναι τοὺς κλητοὺς, ὀλίγους δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.* Yet when they had been banished from the Towns this was their boast in their deserted synagogues "many are called but few are chosen."—And they comforted their friends with Scripture, praising them for not being drawn away when many abandoned them and went over to the *ὁμοούσιον*—(of the same nature, *i.e.* the orthodox who taught that Father and Son were of the same nature); for they repeated "many are called but few chosen."]—Socrat. *Hist. Ecclesiast.* lib. v. cap. 10. [Apud *Eccles. Hist. Scriptor.* ed. Reading. tom. ii. p. 276. The occasion to which the quotation alludes was when, the Novatians agreeing with the orthodox, these bodies alone were allowed by Theodosius to occupy the churches in the city: all the heretics and sectarians being banished from the city, were obliged to hold their assemblies in the country, and by way of consoling their adherents upon the general desertion to which they were subjected, the heterodox bishops and clergy wrote as above.]

[42] Error Origenis et Tertulliani magna fuit in Dei Ecclesia populi tentatio. [The error of Origen and of Tertullian was in the Church of God a severe trial to the people.]—Vincent. Lirinens. *cont. Hæres*, capp. 23, 24. [in tit. pp. 49—55.]

[43] Sect. xxxv. No. 4. [*vide supra*, p. 340.]

[CHAPTER XII.] "That in point of faith and salvation, it is safest for a man to take that way which the adversary confesses to be true, or whereon the differing parties agree"; and that if they do stand to it, they must be forced to maintain the Church of England, in many things, against the Church of Rome.

(1.) And, first, I instance in the article of our Saviour Christ's descent into hell. I hope the Church of Rome believes this Article, and withal that hell is the place of the damned: so doth the Church of England. In this, then, these dissenting Churches agree. Therefore, according to the former rule,—yea, and here in truth, too,—it is safest for a man to believe this Article of the Creed, as both agree; that is, that Christ descended in soul into the place of the damned. But this the Romanists will not endure at any hand. For the School agree in it, that the soul of Christ, in the time of His death, went really no farther than *in limbum patrum*;[44] which is not the place of the damned, but a region or quarter in the upper part of hell, as they call it, built up there by the Romanist, without licence of either Scripture or the primitive Church. And a man would wonder how those builders
Ezek. xiii. 10. "with untempered mortar" found light enough in that dark place to build as they have done.

(2.) Secondly, I will instance in the institution of the sacrament in both kinds. That Christ instituted it so, is confessed by both Churches; that the ancient Churches received it so, is agreed by both Churches: therefore, according to the former rule, and here in truth too, it is safest for a man to receive this sacrament in both kinds. And yet here this ground of A. C. must not stand for good—no, not at Rome; but to receive in one kind is enough for the laity. And the poor Bohemians must have a dispensation that it may be lawful for them to receive the sacrament as Christ commanded them. And this must not be granted to them neither, "unless they will acknowledge,"—most opposite to truth,—"that they are not bound by Divine law to receive it in both kinds."[45]

[44] Sequuntur enim [sc. Scholastici] S. Thom. [For the Schoolmen follow St. Thomas.]—[Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 3. Q[uæst.] lii. A[rtic]. 2. in conclus. [Migne, iv. 478.]—Verba ejus sunt: Anima Christi per suam essentiam descendit solum ad locum inferni, in quo justi detinebantur, etc. [His words are—the soul of Christ in its essence descended only to that part of the lower world where the just are detained.]—[*ubi sup.* p. 52. notes 63, 65, and 71. Laud is much more definite here than on p. 52.]

[45] Basileense Concilium concessit Bohemis utriusque speciei usum: modo faterentur id sibi concedi ab Ecclesia, non autem ad hoc teneri divino jure. [The Council of Basle granted to the Bohemians the use of both kinds—

And here their building "with untempered mortar" appears most manifestly. For they have no show to maintain this but the fiction of Thomas of Aquin, "That he which receives the body of Christ receives also His blood, *per concomitantiam*," "by concomitancy," because the blood goes always with the body; of which term Thomas was the first author I can yet find.[46] First, then, if this be true, I hope Christ knew it: and then why did He so unusefully institute it in both kinds? Next, If this be true, "concomitancy" accompanies the priest as well as the people: and then why may not he receive it in one kind also? Thirdly, This is apparently not true; for the Eucharist is a sacrament *sanguinis effusi*, "of blood shed," and poured out; and blood poured out, and so severed from the body, goes not along with the body *per concomitantiam*. And yet Christ must rather err, or proceed I know not how, in the institution of the sacrament in both kinds, rather than the "holy unerring Church of Rome" may do amiss in the determination for it, and the administration of it in one kind. Nor will the distinction, "That Christ instituted this as a sacrifice, to which both kinds were necessary," serve the turn; for suppose that true, yet He instituted it as a sacrament also, or else that sacrament had no institution from Christ; which I presume A. C. dares not affirm. And that institution which this sacrament had from Christ, was in both kinds.

(3.) And since here is mention happened of sacrifice, my third instance shall be in the sacrifice which is offered up to God in that great and high mystery of our redemption by the death of Christ; for, as Christ offered up Himself once for all, a full and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sin of the whole world,[47] so did He institute and command a memory of this sacrifice in a sacrament,

only they had to admit that this was a concession made to them by the Church; but that they were not bound by Divine law to this practice.] —Bellarmin. *de Sacrament. in genere*, lib. i. cap. 2. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 12. B.]

[46] S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.* par. 3. Q[uæst.] lxxvi. A[rtic]. 2. in conclus. et alibi passim. [*ubi sup.* p. 347. note 32.]

[47] "Christ by His own blood entered once into the holy place, and obtained eternal redemption for us." —*Heb.* ix. 12. And this was done by way of sacrifice. "By the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once made."—*Heb.* x. 10.—"Christ gave Himself for us, to be an offering, and a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour unto God."—*Eph.* v. 2. Out of which place the School infers, Passionem Christi verum sacrificium fuisse. [The passion of Christ was a true sacrifice.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 3. Q[uæst.] xlviii. A[rtic.] 3. in conclus. [Migne, iv. 446.]—"Christ did suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, and made there, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."—Eccles. Ang. in *Canone Consecrationis Euchar.*

[CHAPTER XII.]

even till His coming again.[48] For at and in the Eucharist, we offer up to God three sacrifices: One by the priest only; that is the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in bread broken and wine poured out.[49] Another by the priest and

[48] "And Christ did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again."—Eccles. Ang. *ibid.*

[49] Hoc sacramentum [habet triplicem significationem. Unam quidem respectu præteriti: in quantum scilicet] est commemorativum Dominicæ passionis, quæ fuit verum sacrificium. [This Sacrament has a threefold meaning: one comes from looking back at what is past, in so far, I take it, as it is commemorative of the Lord's passion, which was a true sacrifice — ut supra dictum est, Quæst. xlvii. Artic 3. (*ubi sup.* note 46) et secundum hoc] nominatur sacrificium [and for this reason it is called a sacrifice.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. 3. Q[uæst.] lxxiii. (A[rtic]. 4. in conclus.—"[And] Christ, being offered up once for all in His own proper person, is yet said to be offered up [not only every year at Easter, but also every day] in the celebration of the sacrament, because His oblation, once for ever made, is thereby represented."—Lambert, [*A Treatise of the Sacrament to the King*,] in Foxe's *Martyrology*, vol. ii. ed. London, 1597, p. 1033. [*Acts and Monuments*, vol. ii. p. 365. col. i. ed. London, 1684.]—Et postea, ["Not that the sacrament is His natural body or blood indeed, but that] it is a memorial or representation thereof."—*Ibid.*—"[And] the Master of the Sentences, [of whom all the school authors take their occasion to write,] judged truly in this point, saying, [lib. IV. Dist. xii.] 'That which is offered and consecrated of the priest is called a sacrifice and oblation, because it is a memory, and representation of the true sacrifice and holy oblation, made in the altar of the cross.'"—Archbishop Cranmer in his [*Defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ*, etc.] Book v. [chap. 13. *Works*, vol. ii. p. 458. ed. Jenkyns.]—And again: "This shortly is the mind of Lombardus, That the thing which is done at God's board is a sacrifice, and so is that also which was made upon the cross, but not after one manner of understanding. For this was the thing in deed, and that is the [anniversary] or commemoration of the thing."—Archbishop Cranmer, *Answer to Gardyner*, *the Sacrifice of Christ*, book v. *Works*, *ut sup.* vol. iii. p. 540.]—So likewise Bishop Jewell acknowledgeth *incruentum et rationabile sacrificium*, [an unbloody, reasonable sacrifice], spoken of by Eusebius *de Demonstrat. Evangel.* lib. i. [cap. 10.] Jewell's *Reply against Harding*, Art. xvii. Divis. 9. [*Works*, vol. iii. p. 358. ed. Jelf. His words are: "Touching the sacrifice of the Lord's Table, Eusebius writeth thus: μνήμην ἡμῖν παρέδωκε ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν· 'He gave us a remembrance instead of a sacrifice to offer up continually unto God.' And this he calleth, *incruentum et rationabile sacrificium*; 'the unbloody and reasonable sacrifice.'"]—Again: ["In like manner] the ministration of the holy communion is sometimes of the ancient fathers called an 'unbloody sacrifice'; not in respect of any corporal or fleshly presence, that is imagined to be there without bloodshedding, but for that it representeth, and reporteth unto our minds, that one and everlasting sacrifice that Christ made in His body upon the cross." This Bishop Jewell disliketh not in his *Answer to Harding*, Art. xvii. Divis. 14. [*Works*, vol. iii. p. 375.]—Patres [autem] cœnam Dominicam, [seu ut jam vocant missam,] duplici de causa vocarunt *sacrificium incruentum*: tum quod sit imago et solennis repræsentatio illius sacrificii ἱλαστικοῦ, quod Christus cum sanguinis effusione obtulit in cruce; tum quod sit etiam *Eucharisticum sacrificium*, hoc est, sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis, cum pro beneficiis omnibus, tum pro redemptione inprimis per Christi mortem peracta. [The Fathers called the Lord's Supper (or as they now call it the Mass) an unbloody sacrifice for a double reason: in the first place because it is a represen-

the people jointly; and that is, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we receive by the precious death of Christ.[50] The third, by every particular man for himself only; and that is, the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve Him in both all the rest of his life, for this blessing thus bestowed on him.[51] Now, thus far these dissenting Churches agree, that in the Eucharist there is a sacrifice of duty, and a sacrifice of praise, and a sacrifice of commemoration of Christ. Therefore, according to the former rule, (and here in truth too,) it is safest for a man to believe the commemorative, the praising, and the performing sacrifice, and to offer them duly to God, and leave the Church of Rome in this particular to her superstitions, that I may say no more. And would the Church of Rome stand to A. C.'s rule, and believe dissenting parties where they agree, were it but in this, and that before, of the Real Presence, it would work far toward the peace of Christendom. But the truth is, they

tation and solemn setting forth of that propitiatory sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross with the shedding of His Blood: in the second place because it is also a Eucharistic sacrifice, that is, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving both for all the blessings, and also in particular for the redemption which was wrought by the death of Christ.]—[Hieronym.] Zanchius in *II. præcept. Decalog.* [lib. i. *de cultu Dei externo*, cap. 6. *de Sacrificiis Christianorum*, *Op.*,] tom. iv. col. 460. [ed. Crispini, 1617.]—And Dr. Fulke also acknowledges a sacrifice in the Eucharist, in *St. Matth.* xxvi. 26. [His words are: "The other term (sacrifice) we do not utterly deny, but in a sort. For in such sort as the ancient fathers did call this action a sacrifice, . . . in this sort, I say, we do not utterly deny the term of sacrifice." —Fulke *on the Rhemish Testament*, etc. p. 96. ed. London, 1633.]—Non [igitur] dissimulaverunt Christiani, in cœna Domini, sive ut ipsi loquebantur, in sacrificio altaris, peculiari quodam modo præsentem se venerari Deum Christianorum; sed quæ esset forma ejus sacrificii, quod per symbola panis et vini peragitur, hoc veteres præ se non ferebant. [The Christians did not conceal the fact that in the Lord's Supper or the sacrifice of the altar (to use their own term) they worship the Christians' God after a peculiar and special way: but as to what was the form of that sacrifice, which is carried out by means of the symbols of bread and wine, this the ancients did not reveal but kept secret.]—Isaac. Casauboni, *Exercit. xvi. ad Annales* [*Ecclesiasticos*] *Baronii*, § xliii. p. 560. [p. 402. ed. Francof. 1615.]

[50] In the Liturgy of the Church of England we pray to God immediately after the reception of the sacrament, "That He would be pleased to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," etc.—And: ["By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually,"]—*Heb.* xiii. 15.—[. . . "my doctrine, as well of] the sacrifice propitiatory which was made by Christ Himself only, as of the sacrifice commemorative and gratulatory made by the priests and people."—Archbishop Cranmer, in his *Answer to Gardyner*, book v. p. 377. [*Works*, vol. iii. p. 540.]

[51] "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you give up your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God."—*Rom.* xii. 1. —"We offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto Thee."—So the Church of England in the Prayer after the receiving of the Blessed Sacrament.

[CHAPTER XII.] pretend the peace of Christendom, but care no more for it than as it may uphold, at least, if not increase, their own greatness.

(4.) My fourth instance shall be in the sacrament of baptism, and the things required as necessary to make it effectual to the receiver. They, in the common received doctrine of the Church of Rome, are three—the matter, the form, and the intention of the priest to do that which the Church doth, and intends he should do. Now all other divines, as well ancient as modern, and both the dissenting Churches also, agree in the two former; but many deny that the intention of the priest is necessary. Will A. C. hold his rule: "That it is safest to believe, in a controverted point of faith, that which the dissenting parties agree on, or which the adverse part confesses"? If he will not, then why should he press that, as a rule to direct others, which he will not be guided by himself? And if he will, then he must go professedly against the Council of Trent,[52] which hath determined it as *de fide*, "as a point of faith," that the intention of the priest is necessary to make the baptism true and valid. Though, in the history of that Council,[53] it is most apparent the bishops and other divines there could not tell what to answer to the Bishop of Minors [Minori], a Neapolitan, who declared his judgment openly against it, in the face of that Council.

(5.) My fifth instance is: We say, and can easily prove, there are divers errors, and some gross ones, in the Roman Missal. But I myself have heard some Jesuits confess, that in the Liturgy of the Church of England there is no positive error. And being pressed,

[52] Concil. Tridentin. Sess. vii. Can. 11. [de Sacramentis in genere. Si quis dixerit, in ministris dum Sacramenta conficiunt, et conferunt, non requiri intentionem, saltem faciendi quod facit ecclesia: anathema sit. Concerning the Sacraments in general. If anyone say that intention, at least of doing what the Church does, is not to be required in ministers while they are celebrating and administering the Sacraments, let him be anathema.]

[53] [P. Sarpi.] *Histor. Concil. Trident.* lib. ii. p. 277. ed. Lat. Leidæ, 1622. [*ubi sup.* p. 164. note 35, where the "Bishop" is Catharinus, and p. 318. note 34. Ambrose Catharinus, of Siena (b. 1483 or 1487) was first a jurist, then a Dominican. He became bishop of Minori (a district with Salerno as its capital, and not Minorca, as some have erroneously stated) in 1547, and lastly Archbishop of Conza, in the Kingdom of Naples, in 1552. He wrote against the Protestants, commented on St. Paul's Epistles, and died in 1553. He played a principal part in the sessions of the Trent Councils in 1546-7, especially on Grace and Freewill, in which he professed Predestination; he held that all episcopal power came from the pope alone; and pointed out that the doctrine of Intention took away all certainty from Baptism, Communion, and Orders. The learned French editor of Sarpi, ed. Amsterdam, 1751, asserts that in his time Catharinus' view prevailed in Gallican teaching, as their theologians felt the grave perils of the doctrine of Intention if logically carried out. Cf. Pallavicini, xiii. 1.]

Why then they refused to come to our Churches and serve God with us; they answered, They could not do it; because, though our Liturgy had in it nothing ill, yet it wanted a great deal of that which was good, and was in their Service. Now here let A. C. consider again: here is a plain "concession of the adverse part": and both agree, there is nothing in our service but that which is holy and good. What will the Jesuit, or A. C. say to this? If he forsake his ground, then it is not safest in point of divine worship to join in faith as the dissenting parties agree, or to stand to the adversaries' own confession. If he be so hardy as to maintain it, then the English Liturgy is better and safer to worship God by than the Roman Mass—which yet, I presume, A. C. will not confess. SECTION XXXV.

VIII. In all these instances—the matter so falling out of itself, for the argument enforces it not—"the thing is true, but not therefore true because the dissenting parties agree in it," or because the adverse part confesses it. Yet, lest the Jesuit, or A. C. for him, farther to deceive the weak, should infer that this rule in so many instances is true, and false in none, but that one concerning baptism among the Donatists—and therefore the argument is true *ut plerumque*, "as for the most," and that therefore "it is the safest way to believe that which dissenting parties agree on";—I will lay down some other particulars, of as great consequence as any can be in or about Christian religion. And if in them A. C. or any Jesuit dare say, that it is safest to believe as the dissenting parties agree, or as the adverse party confesses, I dare say he shall be an heretic in the highest degree, if not an infidel.

And first: Where the question was betwixt the orthodox and the Arian, whether the Son of God were consubstantial with the Father. The orthodox said He was ὁμοούσιος, "of the same substance." The Arian came within a letter of the truth, and said He was ὁμοιούσιος, "of like substance." Now he that says, He is of the same substance, confesses He is of like substance—and more, that is, identity of substance; for identity contains in it all degrees of likeness, and more. But he that acknowledges and believes that He is of like nature, and no more, denies the identity. Therefore, if this rule be true, "That it is safest to believe that in which the dissenting parties agree," or, "which the adverse part confesses," which A. C. makes such great vaunt of, then it is safest for a Christian to believe that Christ is of like nature with God the Father, and be free from belief that He is consubstantial with Him; which yet is concluded by the Council of Nice as (1.) A. C. pp. 64, 65.

[CHAPTER XII.] "necessary to salvation," and the contrary condemned for "damnable heresy."[54]

Secondly: In the question about the resurrection, between the orthodox and divers gross heretics[55] of old, and the Anabaptists
(2.) and Libertines[56] of late. For all or most of these dissenting parties agree, that there ought to be a resurrection from sin to a state of grace; and that this resurrection only is meant in divers passages of Holy Scripture; together with the life of the soul, which they are content to say is immortal. But they[57] utterly deny any "resurrection of the body" after death; so with them that article of the Creed is gone. Now then, if any man will guide his faith by this rule of A. C.—the "consent of dissenting parties," or "the confession of the adverse part,"—he must deny the resurrection of the body from the grave to glory, and believe none but that of the soul from sin to grace, which the "adversaries confess," and in which the dissenting parties agree."

(3.) Thirdly: In the great dispute of all others, about the "unity of

[54] Concil. Nicæn. Fides, vel Symbolum in fine Concil. [τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας· ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἢ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, ἢ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία. But as to those who say that there was a time when the Son of God did not exist; or that He did not exist before He was begotten; or that He was made of that which had no existence before; or assert that He is of a different nature and substance (to the Father); or that He was created or is subject to change or variation—those persons the Catholic and Apostolic Church pronounce anathema.—*Concil.* tom. ii. col. 28. C.]

[55] Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Valentinus, Cerdon, Apelles, etc.—Tertull. *de præscript. advers. Hæret.* capp. xlvi. xlviii. xlix. li. etc. [pp. 219—225. ed. Rigalt. Migne, ii. 61-71.]

[56] [A sect originating in Flanders, c. 1525; taught "there was no sin but to those that thought it so; because all came from God."]

[57] Libertini rident spem omnem, quam de resurrectione habemus, idque jam nobis evenisse dicunt, quod adhuc expectamus. [Si quæratur quomodo, id intelligant; nempe, inquiunt,] ut homo sciat animam suam spiritum immortalem esse perpetuo viventem in cœlis: [ac Christum morte Sua opinationem abolevisse, eaque ratione nobis restituisse vitam, quæ in Eo est, ut nos minime mori cognoscamus.] [The Libertines ridicule all the hope which we entertain concerning the Resurrection, and they say that what we are still looking for has already happened to us. If it be asked in what manner they mean that this has happened; then they say that a man knows his soul to be an immortal spirit living eternally in heaven; and that Christ by His death abolished supposition, and in this way restored the life which is in Him, so that we have no knowledge of death.]—Calvin. *Instructione advers. Libertinos*, cap. xxii. in init. [*Op.*, tom. vii. p. 395. col. 1.] —Sunt etiam hodie Libertini qui eam irrident, et resurrectionem, quæ tractatur in Scripturis, tantum ad animas (*al.* animos) referunt. [There are also to-day Libertines who mock at it and say that the Resurrection which is spoken of in Scripture only refers to their souls.]—Pet. Martyr, *Loc. Commun.* Class. iii. cap. xv. [*de Ressurrectione,*] § 4. [p. 486. col. 2. D. ed. Genev. 1624.]

the Godhead," all dissenting parties, Jew, Turk, and Christian—among Christians, orthodox and Anti-Trinitarian of old; and in these later times, orthodox and Socinian, that horrid and mighty monster of all heresies—agree in this, That there is but one God. And I hope it is as necessary to believe one God our Father, as one Church our mother. Now, will A. C. say here, "It is safest believing as the dissenting parties agree," or, "as the adverse parties confess,"—namely, That there is but one God; and so deny the Trinity, and therewith the Son of God the Saviour of the world? SECTION XXXV.

Fourthly: In a point as fundamental in the faith as this—namely, Whether Christ be true and very God—for which very point most of the martyrs[58] in the primitive Church laid down their lives—the dissenting parties here were the orthodox believers, who affirm He is both God and man, for so our Creed teaches us; and all those heretics which affirm Christ to be man, but deny Him to be God—as the Arians,[59] and Carpocratians,[60] and Cerinthus,[61] and Hebion,[62] with others; and at this day the Socinians.[63] These dissenting parties agree fully and clearly, That Christ is man. Well then; dare A. C. stick to his rule here, and say it is safest for a Christian in this great point of faith to govern his (4.) Heb. xi. 37.

[58] Cyrillus Alexandrinus male audivit, quod Ammonium martyrem appellavit, quem constitit temeritatis pœnas dedisse, et non necessitate negandi Christi in tormentis esse mortuum. [ἀλλ' οἱ σωφρονοῦντες, καίπερ Χριστιανοὶ ὄντες, οὐκ ἀπεδέχοντο τὴν περὶ τούτου Κυρίλλου σπουδήν· ἠπίστουν γὰρ, προπετείας δίκην δεδωκέναι τὸν Ἀμμώνιον, οὐ μὴν ἀνάγκῃ ἀρνήσεως Χριστοῦ, ἐναποθανεῖν ταῖς βασάνοις. But sensible men, even though they were Christians did not agree with Cyril's criticism of him (viz. Ammonius): for they did not think that Ammonius had died in torments rather than deny Christ, but had paid the penalty of his rashness.]—[Socrat. *Hist. Ecclesiast.* lib. vii. cap. 14. [apud *Eccles. Hist. Scriptor.* ed. Reading. tom. ii. p. 360.]

[59] S. Optatus, [Milevit. *de Schism. Donatist.*] *contra Parmenian.* lib. iv. [cap. 5. *Op.*, p. 73.]

[60] [A heresy of the 2nd century, originating from Carpocrates of Cæsarea: he maintained that our Lord was the son of Joseph, and an ordinary man; he also justified immorality.]—Tertullian. *lib. de præscript. Hæreticor.* cap. xlviii. [*Op.*, p. 221. C.]

[61] [A heretic of the first century, who denied our Lord's divinity.]—Tertullian. *ibid.* [p. 221. D.]

[62] [A sect called Ebionites existed in the first century, so named either from a man Ebion (Tertullian), or from the Hebrew word for "poor" (Origen). They denied our Lord's divinity.—Poterit hæc opinio Hebioni convenire, qui nudum hominem, et tantum ex semine David, id est, non et Dei Filium, constituit Jesum. This view will be able to suit Hebion, who determined that Jesus was a mere man and born only of the seed of David, that is, did not consider Him the Son of God.]—Tertullian, *lib. de Carne Christi*, cap. xiv. [p. 319. C. Migne, ii. 778.]

[63] [Called from Faustus Socinus of Siena, born in 1539, died in 1604. His tenets spread specially in Poland. He denied the Divinity of Christ.]—Volkelius, *de Religione Christiana*, lib. iii. cap. 1. [p. 38. Joann. Volkelii Misnici, *de vera Relig.* lib. quinque, Racoviæ, 1630.]

[CHAPTER XII.]

belief by "the consent of these dissenting parties," or "the confession and acknowledgment of the adverse party," and so settle his belief, that Christ is a mere man and not God? I hope he dares not. So then, this rule, "To resolve a man's faith into that in which the dissenting parties agree, or which the adverse part confesses," is as often false as true; and false in as great, if not greater matters, than those in which it is true. And where it is true, A. C. and his fellows dare not govern themselves by it; the Church of Rome condemning those things which that rule proves. And yet, while they talk of certainty—nay, of infallibility, less will not serve their turns—they are driven to make use of such poor shifts as these, which have no certainty at all of truth in them, but infer falsehood and truth alike. And yet for this also, men will be so weak, or so wilful, as to be seduced by them.

IX. I told you before,[64] that the force of the preceding argument lies upon two things—the one expressed, and that is past; the other upon the bye, which comes now to be handled. And that is your continual poor outcry against us, "That we cannot be saved because we are out of the Church." Sure, if I thought I were out, I would get in as fast as I could. For we confess as well as you, That out of the catholic Church of Christ there is no salvation.[65] But what do you mean, by "out of the Church"? Sure, out of the Roman Church.[66] Why, but the Roman Church and the Church of England are but two distinct members of that Catholic Church which is spread over the face of the earth. Therefore Rome is not the house where the Church dwells; but Rome itself, as well as other particular churches, dwells in this great universal house—unless you will shut up the Church in Rome, as the Donatists did in Africa. I come a little lower. Rome and other national churches are in this universal

[64] Sect. xxxv. No. 2. *in fine.* [*vide supra*, p. 337.]

[65] Extra hoc corpus neminem vivificat Spiritus Sanctus. [Outside of this body the Holy Spirit imparts life to none.]—S. Augustin. [*Lib. de Correctione Donatist.* seu Epist. clxxxv. ad Bonifacium, aliter] *Epist.* i. [§ 50. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 663. B. Migne, ii. 815.]—[. . . "one Holy Catholic Church, in which only the light of heavenly truth is to be sought, where only grace, mercy, remission of sins, and hope of eternal happiness are found.]—Field, *Of the Church*, book i. ch. 11. [p. 18. ed. Oxford, 1628, p. 39. Edit. Cambridge, 1847.]—Una [vero] est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus [omnino] salvatur. [The Church Universal composed of the faithful is one, and outside it no one whatever is saved.]—Concil. Lateranens. [IV. an. 1215.] Can. i. [*Concil.* tom. xi. col. 143. B.] And yet even there, there is no mention of the Roman Church.

[66] And so doth A. C. too: "Out of the Catholic Roman Church there is no possibility of salvation."—A. C. p. 65.

catholic house as so many daughters,[67] to whom, under Christ, the care of the household is committed by God the Father, and the Catholic Church the mother of all Christians. Rome, as an elder sister, but not the eldest neither,[68] had a great care committed

[67] And "daughter of Sion" was God's own phrase of old of the Church: ["And the daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard," etc.] *Isaiah* i. 8.—[οὐ γὰρ περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοῦτον τὸν λόγον προϋπέφηνεν, οὐδὲ περὶ τῆς Σιὼν τῆς πόλεως, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας· For it was not concerning the Jews or the city of Sion that he uttered this prophetical saying, but concerning the Church.]—Pseudo-] S. Hippolyt. *lib. de Consummatione Mundi*, [cap. iii. *Op.*, tom. i. in Appendice, p. 6. ed. Fabricii, Hamburgi, 1716.]—Et, Omnis Ecclesia *Virgo* appellata est. [The whole Church is called Virgin.] —S. Augustin. in *S. Johan.* cap. iii. Tractat. xiii. [§ 12. *Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 396. G. Migne, iii. 1499.]

[68] For Christ was to be preached to all nations, but that preaching was to begin at Jerusalem, *St. Luke* xxiv. 47, according to the prophecy, *Mic.* iv. 2. "And the Disciples were first called Christians at Antioch," *Acts* xi. 26. And therefore there was a Church there before ever St. Peter came thence to settle one at Rome. Nor is it an opinion destitute either of authority or probability, That the faith of Christ was preached, and the sacraments administered, here in England, before any settlement of a Church in Rome. For St. Gildas, the ancientest monument we have, and whom the Romanists themselves reverence, says expressly, That the religion of Christ was received in Britannie, tempore (ut scimus) summo Tiberii Cæsaris, etc. "in the later time of Tiberius Cæsar."—Gildas *de Excid. Britan.* [Sect. 8.]: whereas St. Peter kept in Jewry long after Tiberius's death. Therefore the first conversion of this island to the faith, was not by St. Peter; nor from Rome, which was not then a Church. Against this Rich. Broughton, in his *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, Century I. chap. viii. § 4. [p. 38. ed. Douay, 1633,] says expressly: ["Therefore, for better satisfaction of his readers, I will cite at large the words of that holy ancient British writer, as our English Protestants have published him to the world, and some manuscripts also have. These they are: Interea glaciali frigore rigenti insulæ, et velut longiore terrarum semper (*al.* secessu) soli visibili non proximæ, verus ille non de firmamento solum temporali, sed de summa etiam cœlorum arce tempora cuncta excedente, universo orbi præfulgidum sui coruscum ostendens tempore, ut scimus, summo Tiberii Cæsaris, quo absque ullo impedimento, ejus promulgabatur religio, comminata, senatu nolente, a principe morte dilatoribus militum ejusdem, radios suos indulget, id est, sua præcepta, Christus. Hitherto the very words of St. Gildas as he is published by] Protestants: who freely acknowledge, that clause 'of the time of Tiberius' to be wanting in other copies of that holy writer, as, namely, in that which was put forth by Polydore Virgil and others." Whereas, first, these words are expressed in a most fair and ancient manuscript of Gildas, to be seen in Sir Robert Cotton's study, if any doubt it. Secondly, these words are as express in the printed edition of Gildas by Polyd. Virg. which edition was printed at London, an. 1525, [fol. vii. *v.*] and was never reprinted since. Thirdly, these words are as express in the edition of Gildas, by Jo. Joscelin, printed at London also, an. 1568, [fol. ix. *v.*] And this falsehood of Broughton is so much the more foul, because he boasts (Præfat. to his reader, *in fine*,) That he hath seen and diligently perused the most and best monuments and antiquities extant, etc. For if he did not see and peruse these, he is vainly false to say it; if he did see them, he is most maliciously false to belie them. And, lastly, whereas he says: The Protestants themselves confess so much, I must believe he is as false in this as in the former, till he name the Protestants to me which do confess it. And when he doth, he shall gain but this from me, That those Protestants

unto her, in and from the prime times of the Church, and to her bishop in her; but at this time (to let pass many brawls that have formerly been in the house) England and some other sisters of hers are fallen out in the family. What then? Will the Father and the Mother, God and the Church, cast one child out, because another is angry with it? Or when did Christ give that power to an elder sister, that she, and her steward the bishop there, should thrust out what child she pleased?—especially when she herself is justly accused to have given the offence that is taken in the house? Or will not both Father and Mother be sharper to her for this unjust and unnatural usage of her younger sisters, but their dear children? Nay, is it not the next way to make them turn her out of doors, that is so unnatural to the rest? It is well for all Christian men and churches, that the Father and Mother of them are not so cursed as some would have them. And salvation need not be feared of any dutiful child, nor outing from the Church, because this elder sister's faults are discovered in the house, and she grown froward for it against them that complained. But as children cry when they are waked out of sleep, so do you, and wrangle with all that come near you. And Stapleton confesses, "That ye were in a dead sleep, and overmuch rest, when the Protestants stole upon you."[69] Now if you can prove that Rome is

which confessed it, were mistaken. For the thing is mistaken. [Of "the most fair and ancient manuscript of Gildas, to be seen in Sir Robert Cotton's study," no trace at present seems to exist. All the MSS. in the Cottonian library catalogued as those of Gildas are of the work of Nennius. Mr. Stevenson, the recent editor of Gildas in the "Historical Society's" series, can trace only the existence of a single MS., containing the *Epistola de excidio Britanniæ*, viz. that at Cambridge, which was used by Gale in his edition of Gildas, *apud Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores*, tom. iii. Oxon. 1691. The clause occurs in this MS., and of course in Gale's edition (p. 3). Both Polydore Virgil, in the dedication of his edition to Cuthbert Tonstal, and Joscelin, in his preface addressed to Matthew Parker, give accounts of the different MSS. of the *Epistola de Excidio*, etc., which they respectively used; but it is doubtful if they now exist. Laud's allusion to the existence of this Cotton MS. is unique: and Mr. Stevenson does not seem to have been aware of it.—Laud's statement, that the first edition of Gildas, that by Polydore Virgil, "was never reprinted since," is incorrect. It is reprinted in the work *Opus Historiarum nostro Sæculo convenientissimum*, Basileæ, 1549. The clause in question occurs at p. 498. Dr. Scott.]

[69] [Sed, benedictus sit Deus in sæcula, licet speciosæ et splendidæ illusiones incautos multorum oculos primo aspectu fascinarent, dum otium et somnus corda eorum aggravabant, hodie tamen novis vestris hæresibus expurgefacti, et ad pleniorem considerationem . . . excitati, sapere incipiunt, etc. But, blessed be God for ever, though plausible and showy ridicule at first sight fascinated the unwary eyes of many while lethargy and sleep made heavy their hearts, yet to-day cleansed from your novel heresies and roused to a fuller reflection they are beginning to show wisdom—Stapleton.] *Falsitatis nota*

properly the Catholic Church itself,[70] as you commonly call it, speak out and prove it. In the mean time you may mark this too, if you will, and it seems you do; for here you forget not what the Bishop said to you.

SECTION XXXV.

in Juellum retorta, etc. Artic. iv. Mendacium 105. [sc. Hardingi, sic Juellus.] [Falsum 355 sc. Juelli, sic Stapleton. *Op.*, tom. iv. p. 1375. A.]

[70] For I am sure there is a Roman Church, that is but a particular.—Bellarm. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 4. [*ubi sup.* p. 6. note 7.] And then you must either show me another Roman Church, which is the catholic; or you must show how one and the same Roman Church is in different respects or relations a particular, and yet the Catholic. Which is not yet done. And I do not say, a particular, and yet *a* catholic; but a particular, and yet *the* catholic Church: for so you speak. For that which Card. Perron hath, That the Roman Church is the Catholic causally, because it infuses universality into all the whole body of the Catholic Church, can, I think, satisfy no man that reads it—that a particular should infuse universality into an universal. [His words are: Et pourtant l'Eglise Romaine, qui comme centre et principe de la communion ecclésiastique, influë l'unité qui est la forme de l'universalité, à l'Eglise Catholique, et par conséquent cause en elle l'universalité, peut être appelée Catholique causalement, encore qu'en son estre elle soit particulière.]—[Card.] Perron, *Reply*, etc. [English transl.] book iv. ch. 9. [p. 410. ed. Douay. *Réplique à la Réponse du Roy de la Grande Bretagne*, liv. i. chap. 62. p. 565. ed. Paris, 1620.]

[ADDITIONAL NOTE ON LAUD'S EUCHARISTIC TEACHING.

Laud's *Eucharistic Devotions*, pp. 72-4 in Volume III. of his collected Works, show the essential importance that he attached to the actual reception of the Holy Communion. He taught persistently the Spiritual Presence of the Saviour's Body and Blood; but that Presence was not *corporal*, nor indeed local. He laid strong stress on the reverent habit which he practised of bowing to the Altar as he passed it: (to quote my words in my *Life of Laud*, p. 129) "not because the Saviour was there (corporally) present in the consecrated elements, but because it was the table of Christ, and symbolised the covenant of grace which He had made with His people." The Real Presence of which he spoke so firmly, as taught by all Divines in the English Church including Ridley and Cranmer, and also by Calvin, was a Spiritual and not a corporal Presence. Critics have hardly been careful enough in making this emphatic. I subjoin a few words from Laud's *Devotions*, p. 72: "And, behold, I quarrel not the words of Thy Son my Saviour's blessed Institution. I know His words are no gross unnatural conceit, but they are spirit and life and supernatural."]

[CHAPTER XIII.

The Roman Church an uncertain Refuge; while the English Church offers Security.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

Simple persons may be saved in the Roman Church, while obstinate teachers of falsehood will be lost. Neither White nor Laud have seen much love of truth in Fisher, and, though they dare not condemn him, they are afraid for him. They conclude, however, that the Roman Church may have always held the fundamental truths of Christianity; if so, it has certainly expounded them wrongly. It has lost the sense and meaning of the Creeds and the Councils. Rome is like a rotten tree still having the same bark, but decayed within. Some of the errors of the Roman Church are fundamental, and therefore damnable if those who hold them will not try to know the truth. The arguments which have been used by the Jesuits in their conferences are always the same: they go over a very small space: they consist of a few truths from Scripture and a few quotations from the Fathers. They do not show careful study of the question from all sides.]

[A. C. p. 64.] **F.** "The lady which doubted," said the Bishop to me, "may be better saved in it than you."

§ 36. **B.** I said so indeed. "Mark that too." Where yet, by the way, these words, "than you," do not suppose person only. For
Rom. xiv. 4. I will "judge no man, that hath another Master to stand or fall to." But they suppose calling and sufficiency in the person: "than you," that is, "than any man of your calling and knowledge," of whom more is required. And then no question of the truth of this speech, "That that person may better be saved," that is easier, "than you"; than any man that knows so much of truth, and opposes against it—as you and others of your calling

do. How far you know truth, other men may judge by your proofs and causes of knowledge; but how far you oppose truth known to you, that is within, and no man can know but God and yourselves. Howsoever, where the foundation is but held, "there, for ordinary men, it is not the vivacity of understanding, but the simplicity of believing, that makes them safe."[1] For St. Augustine speaks there, of men in the Church; and no man[2] can be said simply to be out of the visible Church, that is baptized and holds the foundation. And as it is the "simplicity of believing that makes them safe," yea safest; so is it sometimes a "quickness of understanding," that, loving itself and some bye respects too well, makes men take up an unsafe way about the faith. So that there is no question, but many were saved in corrupted times of the Church, when their "leaders, unless they repented before death, were lost."[3] And St. Augustine's rule will be true, That in all

[1] Ceteram [quippe] turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas, tutissimam facit. [For ordinary men it is not the vivacity of understanding, but the simplicity of believing that makes them most safe.] —[S. Augustin. *contra* [*epistolam quam vocant*] *Fundament.* cap. iv. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 153. B.]—οὐδ σώζει πολλάκις τὸ ἀβασάνιστον· "Omission of inquiry many times saves the people."—S. Gregor. Nazianz. *Orat.* xxi. [*de laudibus magni Athanasii*, § 24. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 401. C.]

[2] "Heretics . . . in respect of the profession of sundry divine verities, which still they retain in common with right believers, [in respect of the power of order, and degree of ministry, which receiving in the Church they carry out with them, and sacraments, which by virtue thereof they do administer, they] still pertain to the Church."—Field, *Of the Church*, Book i. chap. 14. [p. 43. Edit. Cantabr. 1847.]—[Tertio notabimus,] posse aliquem ecclesiæ membrum esse secundum quid, qui tamen simpliciter non est; hæreticus, recedens a fide, non dimittitur ut paganus, sed propter baptismi characterem punitur ut transfuga, et excommunicationis gladio spiritualiter occiditur; [reconciliatus vero non ut infidelis baptizatur, sed ut Christianus, per impositionem manuum, in corpus ecclesiæ redintegratur. In the third place we will mark that any one can be a member of the Church in some particular respect, who yet is not so without qualification: a heretic when he leaves the true Faith is not sent away like a Pagan, but because of the stamp of baptism which he bears he is punished as a deserter and with the sword of excommunication and is put to spiritual death; so when he is reconciled he is not baptised as being an unbeliever, but as being a Christian he is restored into the body of the Church through the laying on of hands.]—Stapleton. *Controv.* i. de Ecclesia in se, Quæst. ii. Artic. 3. Notabile 3. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 529. B.] —"The Apostle pronounces some gone out (*1 John* ii. 19.) from the fellowship of sound [and sincere] believers, when as yet the Christian religion they had not utterly cast off. In like sense and meaning throughout all ages heretics have justly been hated as branches cut off from the true Vine, yet only so far forth cut off, as the heresies have extended. For both heresy and many other crimes which wholly sever from God, do sever from the Church of God, but in part only."—Hooker, *Eccles. Polit.* Book v. ch. lxviii. [§ 6. p. 396. ed. Bayne.]

[3] Ipsis magistris pereuntibus: nisi forte ante mortem resipuerint. [When the leaders themselves, unless they returned to their senses before death,

[CHAPTER XIII.]

corruptions of the Church, "there will ever be a difference between an heretic, and a plain well-meaning man that is misled and believes an heretic."[4] Yet here let me add this for fuller expression: This must be understood of such leaders and heretics as refuse[5] to "hear the Church's" instruction, or to use all the means they can to come to the knowledge of the truth. For else, if they do this, err they may, but heretics they are not; as is most manifest in St. Cyprian's[6] case of rebaptization. For here, though he were a main leader in that error, yet all the whole Church grant him safe, and his followers[7] in danger of damnation. But if any man be a leader, and a teaching heretic, and will add schism[8] to heresy, and be obstinate in both, he without repentance must needs be lost; while many that succeed him in the error only, without the obstinacy, may be saved. For, they which are misled and swayed with the current of the[1] time, hold the same errors with their misleaders, yet not supinely, but with all sober diligence to find out the truth; not pertinaciously, but with all readiness to submit to truth, so soon as it shall be found; not

Matt. xviii. 17.

[1] [of time . . . Editt. 1673, and 1686.]

were lost.]—Luth. *de Serv. Arbit.* Plus peccare hæresiarchas, quam illos, qui a principio aliquam hæresim sunt secuti. [The greater sin is that of the leaders of heresies; more than of those who from the first have followed some heresy.]—Supplement [in tert. part.] Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Q[uæst.] xcix. A[rtic.] 4. in conclus. [Migne, iv. 1442.]

[4] Si mihi, [Honorate,] unum atque idem videretur esse, hæreticus, et credens hæreticis homo, etc. [Were a heretic and a man that believes a heretic one and the same thing in my eyes.]—S. Augustin. *lib. de Utilitat. Credend.* cap. i. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 45. A.]

[5] [Sunt enim hæretici, quod fatendum est,] qui [singulis, vel non multo amplius, dogmatibus] oppugnant regulam veritatis. [For there are heretics, as must be admitted, who in one or very few articles of belief oppose the rule of Truth.]—S. Augustin, *lib. de Hæresibus*, [*ad Quodvultdeum*,] versus finem, [in perorat. *Op.*, tom. viii. col. 27. D.]

[6] Cyprianus Beatus, et Martyr.—S. Augustin. *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. i. cap. xviii. [*Op.*, tom. ix. p. 93. F. Migne, ix. 126.]

[7] Donatistæ vero, qui de Cypriani auctoritate sibi carnaliter blandiuntur. [The Donatists I mean, who after a fleshly fashion flatter themselves on having Cyprian's authority.]—S. Augustin. *de Baptismo contra Donatist.* lib. i. cap. xviii. [Migne, ix. 124.]—Nimium miseri, et, nisi se corrigant, a semetipsis omnino damnati, qui hoc in tanto viro eligunt imitari, etc. [Poor wretches they are and, unless they mend their ways, doomed to complete damnation at their own hands, who in the case of that great man pick out this one point for imitation.]—*Ibid.* cap. xix. [col. 95. A. Migne, ix. 126.]

[8] Falsitatis rei deprehensi Donatistæ, pertinaci dissensione firmata, in hæresim schisma verterunt. [The Donatists after being proved guilty of holding false views, strengthened their obstinate opposition and turned a schism into a heresy.]—[S. Augustin. *de Hæresib.* Hæres. lxix. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 21. D.]—Qui sub vocabulo Christiano doctrinæ resisterent Christianæ. [Men who under the name of Christians opposed themselves to the teaching of Christianity.]—S. Augustin. *de Civ. Dei*, lib. xviii. cap. 51. in prin. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 533. B.]

uncharitably, but retaining an internal communion with the whole visible Church of Christ in the fundamental points of faith, and performance of acts of charity; not factiously, but with an earnest desire and a sincere endeavour, as their place and calling gives them means, for a perfect union and communion of all Christians in truth as well as peace. I say, these, however misled, are neither heretics nor schismatics in the sight of God, and are therefore in a state of salvation. And were not this true divinity, it would go very hard with many poor Christian souls, that have been and are misled on all sides, in these and other distracted times of the Church of Christ; whereas, thus habituated in themselves, they are, by God's mercy, safe in the midst of those waves, in which their misleaders perish. I pray you "mark this"; and so, by God's grace, will I: for our[9] reckoning will be heavier, if we thus mislead on either side, than theirs that follow us. But, I see, I must look to myself; for you are secure. For, SECTION XXXVI.

℣. "Dr. White," said I, "hath secured me, that none of our errors be damnable, so long as we hold them not against our conscience. And I hold none against my conscience." [A. C. p. 66.]

℟. I. It seems, then, you have two securities: Dr. White's assertion, and your conscience. What assurance Dr. White gave you, I cannot tell of myself; nor, as things stand, may I rest upon your Relation. It may be you use him no better than you do me. And sure it is so. For I have since spoken with Dr. White, the late Reverend B. of Ely, and he avows this, and no other answer. "He was asked in the conference between you, 'Whether popish errors were fundamental?' To this he gave an answer, by distinction of the persons which held and professed the errors—namely, that the errors were § 37.

[9] Qui etsi ipsi postmodum ad ecclesiam redeunt, restituere tamen eos, et secum revocare non possunt, qui ab eis seducti, et foris morte præventi extra ecclesiam sine communicatione et pace perierunt; quorum animæ in die judicii de ipsorum manibus expetentur, qui perditionis auctores et duces extiterunt. [And although they themselves subsequently return to the Church, yet it is beyond their power to restore and call back with them those who have been led astray by them, and who while still away from their true home have fallen a prey to death and so have perished outside the Church without communion with her and without peace. Their souls will be demanded on the day of judgment at the hands of those who made themselves the authors and leaders of their destruction.]—S. Cyprian. [*Epist.* lxxii. *ad Stephanum papam de Concilio*, olim] lib. ii. Epist. i. [*Op.*, p. 129. ed. Benedict.]

[CHAPTER XIII.] fundamental *reductive*, 'by a reducement,' if they which embraced them did pertinaciously adhere to them, having sufficient means to be better informed: nay, farther, that they were materially, and in the very kind and nature of them, 'leaven, dross, hay, and stubble.' Yet he thought withal, that such as were misled by education, or long custom, or overvaluing the sovereignty of the Roman Church, and did in simplicity of heart embrace them, might by their general repentance, and faith in the merit of Christ, attended with charity and other virtues, find mercy at God's hands. But that he should say *signanter*, and expressly, That none either of yours or your fellows' errors were damnable, so long as you hold them not against conscience, that he utterly disavows. You delivered nothing to extort such a confession from him. And for yourself, he could observe but small love of truth, few signs of grace in you," as he told me: "yet he will not presume to judge you or your salvation; 'it is the Word of Christ that must judge you at the latter day.'" For your conscience, you are the happier in your error, that you hold nothing against it; especially if you speak not against it while you say so. But this no man can know but yourself, "For no man knows the thoughts of a man, but the spirit of a man that is within him": to which I leave you.

1 Cor. iii. 12.

John xii. 48.

1 Cor. ii. 11.

A. C. p. 67. II. To this A. C. replies. And first he grants, "that Dr. White did not, *signanter* and expressly, say these precise words." So then here is his plain confession: "Not these precise words." Secondly, he saith that "neither did Dr. White *signanter* and expressly make the answer above mentioned." But to this I can make no answer, since I was not present at the first or second Conference. "Thirdly, he saith that the reason which moved the Jesuit, to say Dr. White had secured him, was because the said Doctor had granted, in his first Conference with the Jesuit, these things following: First, that there must be one or other Church continually visible." Though Dr. White, late Bishop of Ely, was more able to answer for himself, yet since he is now dead, and is thus drawn into this discourse, I shall, as well as I can, do him the right which his learning and pains for the Church deserved. And to this first, I grant as well as he, "That there must be some one Church or other continually visible"; or that the militant Church of Christ must always be visible in some particulars, or particular at least, express it as you please. For if this be not so, then there may be a time in which there shall not anywhere be a

visible profession of the name of Christ; which is contrary to the whole scope and promise of the Gospel. SECTION XXXVII.

III. Well, what then? Why, then A. C. adds, "That Dr. White confessed that this visible Church had in all ages taught that unchanged faith of Christ in all points fundamental." Dr. White had reason to say that the visible Church taught so; but that this or that particular visible Church did so teach, sure Dr. White affirmed not; unless in case the whole visible Church of Christ were reduced to one particular only. A. C. p. 67.

IV. But suppose this: what then? Why, then A. C. tells us, that "Dr. White being urged to assign such a Church, expressly granted he could assign none different from the Roman, which held in all ages all points fundamental." Now here I would fain know, what A. C. means by "a Church different from the Roman." For if he mean different in place, it is easy to affirm the Greek Church, which, as hath before been proved,[10] hath ever held and taught the foundation in the midst of all her pressures. And if he mean different in doctrinal things, and those about the faith, he cannot assign the Church of Rome for holding them in all ages. But if he mean different in the foundation itself, the Creed, then his urging to assign a Church is void, be it Rome or any other. For if any other Church shall thus differ from Rome, or Rome from itself, as to deny this foundation, it doth not, it cannot remain a differing Church, *sed transit in non ecclesiam*, "but passes away into no Church," upon the denial of the Creed. A. C. p. 67.

V. Now, what A. C. means, he expresses not, nor can I tell; but I may peradventure guess near it, by that which out of these premises he would infer. For hence, he tells us, "he gathered that Dr. White's opinion was, that the Roman Church held and taught in all ages unchanged faith in all fundamental points, and did not in any age err in any point fundamental." This is very well; for A. C. confesses, he did but "gather" that this was Doctor White's opinion. And what if he gathered that which grew not there, nor thence? For suppose all the premises true, yet no cart-rope can draw this conclusion out of them, and then all A. C.'s labour is lost. For grant some one Church or other must still be visible; and grant that this visible Church held all fundamentals of the faith in all ages; and grant again that Dr. White could not assign any Church differing from the Roman that did this: yet this will not follow, That therefore the Roman A. C. p. 67.

[10] Sect. ix. [*vide supra*, p. 27, etc.]

[CHAPTER XIII.] did it. And that because there is more in the conclusion than in the premises. For A. C.'s conclusion is, "That in Dr. White's opinion the Roman Church held and taught in all ages unchanged faith in all fundamental points." And so far, perhaps, the conclusion may stand, taking "fundamental points" in their literal sense, as they are expressed in Creeds and approved Councils. But then he adds, "and did not in any age err in any point fundamental." Now this can never follow out of the premises before laid down. For, say some one Church or other may still be visible; and that visible Church hold all fundamental points in all ages; and no man be able to name another Church different from the Church of Rome that hath done this: yet it follows not therefore, That the Church of Rome did not err in any age in any point fundamental. For a Church may hold the fundamental point literally, and, as long as it stays there, be without control; and yet err grossly, dangerously, nay, damnably, in the exposition of it. And this is the Church of Rome's case. For most true it is, it hath in all ages maintained the faith unchanged in the expression of the Articles themselves; but it hath in the exposition both of Creeds and Councils quite changed, and lost the sense and the meaning of some of them. So the faith is in many things changed, both for life and belief, and yet seems the same. Now that which deceives the world is, That because the bark is the same, men think this old decayed tree is as sound as it was at first, and not weather-beaten in any age. But when they can make me believe that painting is true beauty, I will believe, too, that Rome is not only sound but beautiful.

A. C. p. 67.

A. C. p. 67. VI. But A. C. goes on and tells us, "That hereupon the Jesuit asked, Whether errors in points not fundamental were damnable? And that Dr. White answered, they were not, unless they were held against conscience." It is true, that error in points not fundamental is the more damnable, the more it is held against conscience; but it is true too, that error in points not fundamental may be damnable to some men, though they hold it not against their conscience. As, namely, when they hold an error in some dangerous points which grate upon the foundation, and yet will neither seek the means to know the truth, nor accept and believe truth when it is known; especially being men able to judge, which I fear is the case of too many at this day in the Roman Church.

A. C. p. 68.

A. C. p. 68. Out of all which, A. C. tells us, "the Jesuit collected, that Dr. White's opinion was, That the Roman Church held all points

fundamental, and only erred in points not fundamental; which he accounted not damnable, so long as he did not hold them against his conscience: and that thereupon he, said Dr. White, had secured him, since he held no faith different from the Roman, nor contrary to his conscience." Here, again, we have but A. C.'s and the Jesuit's collection: but if the Jesuit or A. C. will collect amiss, who can help it?

VII. I have spoken before in this very paragraph to all the passages of A. C. as supposing them true; and set down what is to be answered to them, in case they prove so. But now it is most apparent by Dr. White's answer, set down before at large,[11] that he never said "that the Church of Rome erred only in points not fundamental," as A. C. would have it; but that he said the contrary—namely, "that some errors of that Church were fundamental *reductive*, 'by a reducement,' if they which embraced them did pertinaciously adhere to them, having sufficient means of information." And again expressly, that he did not say, "that none were damnable, so long as they were not held against conscience." Now where is A. C.'s collection? For if a Jesuit, or any other, may collect propositions, which are not granted him, nay, contrary to those which are granted him, he may infer what he please. And he is much to blame that will not infer a strong conclusion for himself, that may frame his own premises, say his adversary what he will. And just so doth A. C. bring in his conclusion, to secure himself of salvation, "because he holds no faith but the Roman, nor that contrary to his conscience": presupposing it granted, that the Church of Rome errs only in not fundamentals, and such errors not damnable, which is absolutely and clearly denied by Dr. White. To this A. C. says nothing, but that Dr. White "did not give this answer at the Conference." I was not present at the Conference between them, so to that I can say nothing as a witness. But I think all that knew Dr. White will believe his affirmation as soon as the Jesuit's, to say no more. And whereas A. C. refers to the Relation of the Conference between Dr. White and M. Fisher; most true it is, there Dr. White is charged to have made that answer twice.[12] But all this rests upon the credit of A. C. only: for he is said to have

A. C. p. 67.

A. C. p 67.

[11] Sect. xxxvii. No. 1. [*vide supra*, p. 371.]

[12] A. C. in his Relation of that Conference, p. 26. ["M. F. marvelling at Dr. White's answer, asked him again the same question, saying: 'May one be saved that holdeth error in points of faith, not fundamental, supposing he hold not against his conscience?' Dr. White said: 'Yes.'"]

[CHAPTER XIII.] made that Relation too, as well as this.[13] And against his credit I must engage Dr. White's, who hath avowed another answer, as before is set down.[14]

VIII. And since A. C. relates to that Conference, which it seems he makes some good account of, I shall here, once for all, take occasion to assure the reader, that most of the points of moment in that Conference with Dr. White are repeated again and again, and urged in this Conference, or the Relation of A. C., and are here answered by me. For instance: (1.) In the Relation of the first Conference, the Jesuit takes on him to prove the unwritten word of God out of *2 Thess.* ii. (page 15.) And so he doth in the Relation of this Conference with me, (p. 50.) (2.) In the first, he stands upon it, "That the Protestants upon their principles cannot hold, that all fundamental points of faith are contained in the Creed," (p. 19.) And so he doth in this, (p. 46.) (3.) In the first, he would fain, through Master Rogers' sides, wound the Church of England, as if she were unsettled in the article of Christ's Descent into Hell, (p. 21.) And he endeavours the same in this, (p. 46.) (4.) In the first, he is very earnest to prove, "That the schism was made by the Protestants," (p. 23.) And he is as earnest for it in this, (p. 55.) (5.) In the first, he lays it for a ground, "That corruption of manners is no just cause of separation from faith or Church," (p. 24.) And the same ground he lays in this, (p. 55.) (6.) In the first he will have it, "That the Holy Ghost gives continual and infallible assistance to the Church," (p. 24.) And just so will he have it in this, (p. 53.) (7.) In the first, he makes much ado about the "erring of the Greek Church," (p. 28.) And as much makes he in this, (p. 44.) (8.) In the first, he makes a great noise about the place in St. Augustine "*Ferendus est disputator errans*," etc. (pp. 18 and 24.) And so doth he here also, (p. 45.) (9.) In the first, he would make his proselytes believe, that he and his cause have mighty advantage by that sentence of St. Bernard, "It is intolerable pride"; and that of St. Augustine, "It is insolent madness to oppose the doctrine or practice of the Catholic Church," (p. 25.) And twice he is at the same art in this, (pp. 56 and 73.) (10.) In the first, he tells us, That Calvin confesses, "That in the Reformation there was a departure from the whole

[13] For so it is said in the Title-page by A.C.

[14] Sect. xxxvii. No. 1. [*vide supra*, p. 371.]

world,"[15] (p. 25.) And though I conceive Calvin spake this but of the Roman world, and of no voluntary but a forced departure, and wrote this to Melancthon to work unity among the Reformers, not any way to blast the Reformation; yet we must hear of it again in this, (p. 56.) (11.) But over and above the rest, one place with his own gloss upon it pleases him extremely; it is out of St. Athanasius's Creed: "That whosoever doth not hold it entire—that is," saith he, "in all points; and inviolate—that is," saith he, "in the true, unchanged, and uncorrupted sense proposed unto us by the pastors of his Catholic Church," "without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." This he hath almost verbatim in the first, (p. 20;) and in the epistle of the publisher of that Relation to the reader, under the name of W. I. [p. 2]; and then again the very same in this, if not with some more disadvantage to himself, (p. 70.) And perhaps, had I leisure to search after them, more points than these. Now the reasons which moved me to set down these particulars thus distinctly are two. The one, that whereas the [A. C. p. 68.] Jesuit[16] affirms, that in a second Conference all the speech was about particular matters, and little or nothing about the main and great general point of a continual, infallible, visible Church, in which that lady required satisfaction; and that therefore this third Conference was held: it may hereby appear that the most material, both points and proofs, are upon the matter the very same in all the three Conferences,—though little be related of the second Conference by A. C., as appears in the preface of the publisher, W. I., to the reader. So this tends to nothing but ostentation and show. The other is, that whereas these men boast so much of their cause, and their ability to defend it, it cannot but appear by this, and their handling of other points in divinity, that they labour, indeed, but no otherwise than like a horse in a mill; round about in the same circle; no farther at night than at noon; the same thing over and over again; from *Tu es Petrus*, to *Pasce oves*—from "Thou art Peter," to "Do thou feed My sheep," and back again the same way.

[15] Postquam discessionem a toto mundo facere coacti sumus. [After that we were compelled to make our departure from the whole world.]—Calvin. *Epist.* 141. [*ad Melanchthonem*, p. 273. ed. Hanoviæ, 1597.]

[16] In the beginning of the Conference [with Laud] set out by A. C. [*ubi supra*, p. 4.]

[CHAPTER XIV.

A direct question. Can I be saved in the Roman Church? Can I be saved in the English Church?

Summary of Argument.

The Countess' problem. Fisher says there is but one saving Faith in which all is fundamental. Laud says that an absolute belief in all doctrines is not required for salvation. He will not venture to say exactly what will damn a man. But he will say that the English Church holds all the primitive faith which is the one saving faith, and that Rome has transgressed from it. To be precise, the Romans have transgressed from the primitive Faith about the Descent into Hell; Purgatory; Communion in one kind; the need of Intention in the Priest; Worship of Images; Transubstantiation. Let the Jesuit now produce any article in which the English Church has transgressed.

The Jesuit replies, that to question the infallibility of a General Council is to question the infallibility of the Church. Laud answers that the 2nd General Council of Ephesus erred. It had to be corrected by the Council of Chalcedon. Again the Jesuit asks; How is the English Church to know it has the entire Scriptures or to rely on the Creed or on the Canons of Councils, since they have no infallible Guide to assure them of this? Laud repeats the former arguments of Chapters vi. and vii. for the proof of Canonical Scripture. The Creed he is sure about, because the Church tradition persuades him, and the Scripture confirms each Article. For the Canons of Councils he has history, which is the best possible witness to their genuine character. As to the Jesuit, he is full of traps and catches, but has no infallible guide himself apart from Scripture; indeed his so-called infallible proof is often used to prove things which are untrue, e.g. Communion in one kind, the right of the Pope to dethrone Princes, Transubstantiation, etc. These no ancient Council supports. His arguments from the Athanasian Creed that the whole Roman faith must be kept start with a mistranslation.

Further, the Roman doctrine of Purgatory is not taught by Scripture or the primitive Church. It was defined by the Council of Florence in 1438; and again with anathemas at Trent. Bellarmine indeed names 22 Fathers; but only Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen in the first centuries. Tertullian and Cyprian he quotes wrongly; and Origen says there is no Hell, but a Purgatory in which Satan himself will be purged. Ambrose and Jerome have very vague remarks; Basil and Paulinus are wrongly quoted; and a very dubious passage in Gregory of Nazianzum Bellarmine gives incorrectly. There are two important passages put forward from Gregory of Nyssa and from Theodoret; but the passage from Theodoret is not in his works at all; and Gregory contradicts himself. Augustine leaves the whole matter doubtful. Therefore, Purgatory was certainly not an Apostolic tradition. The Jesuit repeats that a Council has defined it, and a Council is infallible. No, says Laud, no one is infallible, not even the Pope. Christian men must continue to be doubtful about many points. Christ has left no authority on earth to decide them. It is a duty not to overdefine nor to multiply dogmas.

The Jesuit's One Holy Catholic Church is not the "One," nor "Holy," nor "Catholic" in extent or in belief; nor is it even the prime Mother Church, for that was Jerusalem. St. Cyprian does not apply the words "root and matrix" to Rome but to the Catholic Church. The Roman Church is admittedly Apostolic, for it was founded by great Apostles; but others have a right to the title also.]

℣. The Lady asked, Whether she might be saved in the Protestant faith? "Upon my soul," said the ℟. "you may." "Upon my soul," said I, "there is but one saving faith, and that is the Roman."

I. ℟. So, it seems, I was confident for the faith professed in the Church of England, else I would not have taken the salvation of another upon my soul. And sure I had reason of this my confidence; for to believe the Scripture and the Creeds, to believe these in the sense of the ancient primitive Church, to receive the four great General Councils so much magnified by antiquity, to believe all points of doctrine, generally received as fundamental in the Church of Christ, is a faith in which to live and die cannot but give salvation. And therefore I went upon a sure ground in the adventure of my soul upon that faith. Besides, in all the points of doctrine that are controverted between us, I would fain see any one point maintained by the Church of England that can be proved to depart from the foundation. You have many dangerous errors about the very foundation, in that which you § 38.

CHAPTER XIV.] call the Roman faith: but there I leave you to look to your own soul and theirs whom you seduce. Yet this is true, too, that there is "but one saving faith." But then everything which you call *de fide*, "of the faith," because some Council or other hath defined it, is not such a breach from that "one saving faith," as that he which expressly believes it not—nay, as that he which believes the contrary—is excluded from salvation, so his disobedience therewhile offer no violence to the peace of the Church, nor the charity which ought to be among Christians.[1] And Bellarmine is forced to grant this: "There are many things *de fide*, which are not absolutely necessary to salvation."[2] Therefore there is a latitude in the faith, especially in reference to different men's salvation.[3] To set bounds to this, and strictly to define it for particular men—Just thus far you must believe in every particular, or incur damnation—is no work for my pen.[4] These two things I am sure of: one, That your peremptory establishing of so many things that are remote deductions from the foundation, to be believed as matters of faith necessary to salvation, hath, with other errors, lost the peace and unity of the Church, for which you will one day answer. And the other, That you of Rome are gone farther from the foundation of this "one saving faith," than can ever be proved we of the Church of England have done.

C. p. 68. II. But here A. C. bestirs himself, finding that he is come upon the point which is indeed most considerable. And, first, he answers, "That it is not sufficient to beget a confidence in this case, to say we believe the Scriptures and the Creeds in the same sense which the ancient primitive Church believed them," etc.[5]

[1] Sect. xxxii. No. 5. [*vide sup.* p. 262.]

[2] Si esset [vera Calvini sententia, maxima pars dogmatum fidei in dubium revocari posset: nam] multa sunt de fide, quæ non sunt absolute necessaria ad salutem. [If the decision of Calvin were true, the larger part of the dogmas of faith may be proved doubtful; for many things are matters of faith, which are not absolutely necessary to salvation.]—Bellarmin. *de Eccles. Militant.* lib. iii. cap. 14. § 13. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 150. A.]

[3] Thom. Waldens, *Doctrinal. Fidei*, [tom. i.] lib. ii. Artic. ii. cap. 23. [fol. 107. col. 3.]

[4] Sect. xxxviii. No. 8. [*vide infra*, p. 389.]

[5] Pope Pelagius the Second thought it was sufficient; for when the Bishops of Istria deserted his communion *in causa trium Capitulorum*, (because of the three Chapters) he first gives them an account of his faith, that he embraced that faith which the Apostles had delivered and the four Synods explicated: [Nos enim illam fidem prædictam tenemus, et cum omni puritate conscientiæ usque ad sanguinis effusionem defendimus, quæ sub apostolis tradita etc. . . . Unam eandemque fidem, quæ ab apostolis tradita, et sanctis patribus et prædictis quatuor synodis explanata atque

Most true, if we only say, and do not believe. And let them which believe not, while they say they do, look to it on all sides; for on all sides I doubt not but such there are. But if we do say it, you are bound in charity to believe us, unless you can prove the contrary; for I know no other proof to men of any point of faith, but confession of it and subscription to it: and for these particulars we have made the one and done the other. So it is no bare saying, but you have all the proof that can be had, or that ever any Church required: for how far that belief, or any other, sinks into a man's heart, is for none to judge but God.

III. Next, A. C. answers, "That if to say this be a sufficient cause of confidence, he marvels why I make such difficulty to be confident of the salvation of Roman Catholics, who believe all this in a far better manner than Protestants do." Truly, to say this, is not a sufficient cause; but to say and believe it, is. And to take off A. C.'s wonder why I make difficulty—great difficulty—of the salvation of Roman Catholics, "who," he says, "believe all this, and in a far better manner than Protestants do," I must be bold to tell him, that Romanists are so far from believing this in a better manner than we do, that, under favour, they believe not part of this at all. And this is most manifest: for the Romanists dare not believe but as the Roman Church believes; and the Roman Church at this day doth not believe the Scripture and the Creeds in the sense in the which the ancient primitive Church received them. For the primitive Church never interpreted Christ's descent into hell to be no lower than *limbus patrum*; nor did it acknowledge a purgatory in a side-part of hell; A. C. p. 68.

confirmata dignoscitur, sincerissime teneri atque defendi modis omnibus comprobatur. For we hold the aforesaid faith and defend it with all purity of conscience even to the shedding of our blood—which was handed down from the Apostles etc. . . . That one same faith which is distinguished as handed down by the Apostles and explained by the holy fathers and the four Councils already mentioned, we acknowledge must be held in all sincerity and defended by all means.]—And then he adds: Ubi ergo de fidei firmitate nulla vobis poterit quæstio, vel suspicio generari, [in unitate fidei, atque in sinu sanctæ matris catholicæ atque apostolicæ ecclesiæ permanete. Since therefore no doubt or suspicion can arise in your hearts about the security of the faith, remain in the unity of that faith and in the bosom of your holy mother the Catholic and Apostolic Church.]—*Concil.* tom. iv. p. 473. ed. Paris. [*Concil.* tom. v. col. 941. D. col. 942. A.] So, then, that Pope thought there could be no question made, or suspicion had, of any man's faith that professed that faith which the Apostles delivered, as it is explicated by those great Councils. And yet now with A. C. it is not sufficient. Or else he holds the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ in such "respect of persons," (contrary to the Apostle's rule, *St. James* ii. 1,) as that profession of it which was sufficient for Pope Pelagius, shall not be sufficient for the poor Protestants.

[CHAPTER XIV.] nor did it ever interpret away half the sacrament from Christ's own institution, which to break, Stapleton confesses expressly is a "damnable error";[6] nor make the intention of the priest of the essence of baptism; nor believe worship due to images; nor dream of a Transubstantiation, which the learned of the Roman party dare not understand properly, for a change of one substance into another, for then they must grant that Christ's real and true body is made of the bread, and the bread changed into it, which is properly transubstantiation; nor yet can they express it in a credible way, as appears by Bellarmine's struggle about it,[7] which

[6] Stapleton, vol. iv. p. 1253. *Return of Untruths upon Bishop Jewell.* [*ubi sup.* p. 301. note 121.]

[7] [Ecclesiæ igitur sententia est, rationem proximam et propriam, cur sit in Eucharistia verum Domini corpus, non esse assumptionem panis ad personam Verbi, neque ubiquitatem, neque simplicem, et quasi localem, unionem panis cum corpore, neque mutationem partialem panis in corpus, sed] totalem conversionem substantiæ panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Domini. [Therefore this is the decision of the Church that the most ready and correct reason, why the real body of the Lord is in the Eucharist, is not the absorption of the bread into the person of the Word, nor His ubiquity nor a simple or as it were local union of the bread with the Body, nor a partial change of the bread into His body, but a complete conversion of the substance of bread and wine into the body and blood of the Lord.]—Bellarmin. *de* [*Sacrament.*] *Euchar.* lib. iii. cap. 18. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 615. D.]—*substantialem conversionem* seu *transubstantionem*, sicut Ecclesia appellat.] [A substantial conversion or transubstantiation, as the Church calls it.]—Gregor. de Valent. *Disp.* [*General.*] vi. [*de Sacrament. Eucharist.*] Q[uæst.] iii. [de Præsentia Christi in Eucharist.] Punct. 3. [Qualis sit illa conversio panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Dom. § 1. *Op.*,] tom. iv. [col. 1038. A. ed. Paris. 1609. Such as is the conversion of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of the Lord.]—Now you shall see what stuff Bellarmine makes of this. Conversio panis in corpus Domini, nec est *productiva*, nec *conservativa*, sed *adductiva*. Nam corpus Domini præexistit ante conversionem, sed non sub speciebus panis. Conversio igitur non facit, ut corpus Christi simpliciter esse incipiat, sed ut incipiat esse sub speciebus panis, etc. [The conversion of the bread into the Lord's body is not productive, nor conservative, but adductive. For the body of the Lord existed before the conversion, but not under the species of bread. Conversion therefore does not cause the body of Christ to begin to exist simply (or precisely), but to begin to exist under the species of bread.]—Bellarmin. *de Euchar.* lib. iii. cap. 18. § 11. [*ubi sup.* p. 340. note 171.] So, upon the whole matter, there shall be a total conversion of the bread into the body of Christ. And yet there shall be no conversion at all, but a bringing of the body of Christ, before pre-existent, to be now under the species of bread, where before it was not. Now this is merely translocation, it is not transubstantiation. And I would have Bellarmine, or any Jesuit for him, show where *conversio adductiva* is read in any good author. But when Bellarmine comes to the Recognition of his works upon this place, he tells us, "that some excepted against him, as if this were translocation, rather than transubstantiation." So in this charge upon him I am not alone; and fain would he shift off this, but it will not be. But while he is at it, he runs into two pretty errors, beside the main one. The first is, "That the body of Christ in the sacrament begins to be *non ut in loco, sed ut substantia sub accidentibus*," [not as it were in a place, but as a substance under the covering

yet in the end cannot be, or be called, transubstantiation, and is that which at this day is a scandal to both Jew and Gentile, and the Church of God.[8]

of accidents.] Now, let Bellarmine, or A. C. for him, give me any one instance, that a bodily substance under accidents is, or can be, anywhere, and not *ut in loco*, "as in some place;" and he says somewhat. The second is, "That some fathers and others seem," he says, but I see it not, "to approve of his manner of speech of conversion by adduction." And he tells us for this, that Bonaventura says expressly, "In transubstantiatione fit, ut quod erat *alicubi*, sine sui mutatione fit *alibi*." [In transubstantiation it happens that what was in one place comes without any change of itself to be in another.] Now, first, here is nothing that can be drawn with cart-ropes to prove conversion by adduction; for if there be conversion, there must be change: and this is *sine mutatione sui* [without any change of itself]. And, secondly, I would fain know how a body that is *alicubi* shall be *alibi*, without change of itself; and yet that this shall be rather transubstantiation than translocation. Besides, it is a phrase of very sour consequence,—should a man squeeze it,—which Bellarmine uses there, even in his Recognition, *Panis transit in corpus Christi*. [The bread changes into the body of Christ. *Ubi supra*, p. 340. note 18.]

[8] A scandal, and a grievous one. For this gross opinion was but confirmed in the Council of Lateran: it had got some footing in the Church the two blind ages before. For Berengarius (d. 1088) was made recant in such terms as the Romanists are put to their shifts to excuse.—Bellarmin. *de* [*Sacrament*] *Eucharist*. lib. iii. cap. 18. § 11. For he says expressly: [Ego Berengarius . . . anathematizo omnem hæresim, præcipue eam . . . quæ astruere conatur panem, et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem solummodo sacramentum, et non verum] corpus [et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu] Christi [esse, nec] posse sensualiter, [nisi] in [solo] sacramento manibus sacerdotum tractari, vel frangi, aut fidelium dentibus atteri . . . [ore et corde profiteor . . . scilicet: panem, et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter non solum in sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri. [I, Berengar . . . anathematize every heresy, chiefly that one . . . which tries to make out that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar, after consecration, are only a sacrament and not the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and cannot be in accordance with the senses handled by the hands of the priests, but only in a sacramental fashion, nor be broken, nor be crushed by the teeth of the faithful . . . I profess with voice and heart . . . that the bread and wine which are placed on the altar, are after the consecration not only a sacrament, but the actual body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in accordance with the senses not only as a sacrament, but as a reality are handled by the hands of the priests, are broken and are crushed by the teeth of the faithful.—The Gloss adds: Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incides hæresim, quam ipse habuit: et ideo omnia referas ad species ipsas. Unless you properly understand the words of Berengar, you fall into a worse heresy than his; and thus refer all to the species only (*i.e.* make them simply bread and wine).]—Decret. par. iii. de Consecrat. Dist. 2. cap. [xlii.] *Ego Berengarius*. Now this recantation was made about the year 1050; and the Council of Lateran was in the year 1215. Between this gross recantation of Berengarius and that Council, the great learned physician and philosopher Averroes lived, and took scandal at the whole body of Christian religion for this. And thus he saith. Mundum peragravi, [multas adeoque omnes regiones circuivi,] varias sectas inveni, sed Christiana deteriorem, aut etiam tam fatuam, quam sata est Christianorum, non reperi, quia Deum suum, quem colunt, dentibus devorant.—[I have travelled over the world, I have gone over many, almost all regions, I have found many sects, but

[CHAPTER XIV.]

IV. For all this, A. C. goes on, and tells us "that they," of Rome, "cannot be proved to depart from the foundation, so
A. C. p. 69. much as Protestants do." So, then, we have at last a confession here, that they may be proved to depart from the foundation, though not so much or so far as the Protestants do. I do not mean to answer this, and prove that the Romanists do depart as far, or farther from the foundation than the Protestants: for then A. C. would take me at the same lift, and say I granted a departure too. Briefly, therefore, I have named here more instances than one, in some of which they have erred in the foundation, or very near it. But for the Church of England, let A. C. instance, if he can, in any one point in which she hath departed from the
A. C. p. 69. foundation. Well, that A. C. will do; for he says, "The Protestants err against the foundation by denying infallible authority to a General Council, for that is in effect to deny infallibility to the whole Catholic Church." No; there is a great deal of difference between a General Council and the whole body of the Church.[9] And when a General Council errs, as the second of Ephesus did, out of that great Catholic body another may be gathered, as was then that of Chalcedon, to do the truth of Christ that right which belongs unto it. Now, if it were all one in effect to say, A General Council can err, and that The whole Church can err, there were no remedy left against a General Council erring; which is your case now at Rome, and which hath thrust the Church of Christ into more straits than any one thing besides.[10] But I know where you would be. A General Council is infallible, if it be confirmed by the pope; and the pope, he is infallible, else he could not make the Council so; and they which deny the Council's infallibility deny the pope's, which confirms it. And then, indeed, the Protestants depart a mighty way from this great "foundation of faith"—the pope's infallibility. But God be thanked, this is only from the founda-
A. C. p. 68. tion of the present Roman faith,—as A. C. and the Jesuit call it,—not from any "foundation" of the Christian faith, to which this infallibility was ever a stranger.

a sect worse than the Christians, or even as foolish as the sect of the Christians, I have not met with, for they devour with their teeth the God whom they worship.]—[Claud.] Espencæi, [Doct. Paris.] *de Eucharist. Adorat.* lib. iv. cap. 3. [*Op.*, p. 1134. col. 2. ed. Paris. 1619. [Cf. Gore, *The Body of Christ*, 1901, for full historical treatment of the subject.]

[9] [Sect. xxxiii. Consid. 4. No. 1. [*ubi supra*, p. 279.]

[10] Sect. xxxiii. Consid. 7. No. 4. [*ubi supra*, p. 298.]

V. From answering, A. C. falls to asking questions. I think he means to try whether he can win anything upon me by the cunning way, *a multis interrogationibus simul*, "by asking many things at once," to see if any one may make me slip into a confession inconvenient. And first, he asks "How Protestants, admitting no infallible rule of faith but Scripture only, can be infallibly sure that they believe the same entire Scripture, and Creed, and the four first General Councils, and in the same incorrupted sense in which the primitive Church believed?" It is just as I said. Here are many questions in one, and I might easily be caught, would I answer in gross to them all together; but I shall go more distinctly to work. Well, then; I admit no ordinary rule left now in the Church, of divine and infallible verity, and so of faith, but the Scripture. And I believe the entire Scripture, first, by the tradition of the Church; then, by all other credible motives, as is before expressed;[11] and last of all, by the light which shines in the Scripture itself, kindled in believers by the Spirit of God. Then, I believe the entire Scripture infallibly, and by a divine infallibility am sure of my object. Then am I as sure of my believing, which is the act of my faith, conversant about this object: for no man believes, but he must needs know in himself whether he believes or no, and wherein and how far he doubts. Then I am infallibly assured of my Creed, the tradition of the Church inducing, and the Scripture confirming it. And I believe both Scripture and Creed, in the same uncorrupted sense which the primitive Church believed them; and am sure that I do so believe them, because I cross not in my belief anything delivered by the primitive Church. And this, again, I am sure of, because I take the belief of the primitive Church, as it is expressed and delivered by the Councils and ancient Fathers of those times. As for the four Councils, if A. C. ask how I have them, that is, their true and entire copies? I answer, I have them from the Church-tradition only; and that is assurance enough for this. And so I am fully as sure as A. C. is, or can make me. But if he ask, How I know infallibly I believe them in their "true and uncorrupted sense"? then I answer, There is no man of knowledge, but he can understand the plain and simple decision expressed in the canon of the Council, where it is necessary to salvation. And for all other debates in the Council, or decisions of it in things of less moment,

SECTION XXXVIII.

A. C. p. 69.

[11] [Sect. xvi. *vide supra*, pp. 70—132.]

it is not necessary that I, or any man else, have infallible assurance of them; though I think it is possible to attain, even in these things, as much infallible assurance of the uncorrupted sense of them, as A. C. or any other Jesuits have.

A. C. p 69. VI. A. C. asks again, "What text of Scripture tells, that Protestants now living do believe all this, or that all this is expressed in those particular Bibles, or in the writings of the Fathers and Councils, which now are in the Protestants' hands?" Good God! Whither will not a strong bias carry even a learned judgment! Why, what consequence is there in this! The Scripture now is the only ordinary infallible rule of divine faith. Therefore the Protestants cannot believe all this before mentioned, unless a particular text of Scripture can be showed for it. Is it not made plain before, how we believe Scripture to be Scripture, and by divine and infallible faith too, and yet we can show no particular text for it? Beside, were a text of Scripture necessary, yet that is for the object and the thing which we are to believe, not for the act of our believing, which is merely from God, and in ourselves, and for which we cannot have any warrant from or by Scripture, more than that we ought to believe—but not that we in our particular do believe. The rest of the question is far more inconsequent: "Whether all this be expressed in the Bibles which are in Protestants' hands?" For, first, We have the same Bibles in our hands, which the Romanists have in theirs; therefore, either we are infallibly sure of ours, or they are not infallibly sure of theirs. For we have the same book, and delivered unto us by the same hands; and all is expressed in ours, that is in theirs. Nor is it of moment in this argument, that we account more apocryphal than they do; for I will acknowledge every "fundamental point of faith" as proveable out of the canon, as we account it, as if the apocryphal were added unto it. Secondly, A. C. is here extremely out of himself, and his way; for his question is, "Whether all this be expressed in the Bibles which we have?" All this? All what? Why, before there is mention of the four General Councils; and in this question here is mention of "the writings of the Fathers and the Councils." And what, will A. C. look that we must show a text of Scripture for all this, and an express one too? I thought, and do so still, it is enough to ground belief upon necessary consequence [12] out of

[12] Non potest aliquid certum esse certitudine fidei, nisi aut immediate contineatur in verbo Dei; aut ex verbo Dei per evidentem consequen-

Scripture, as well as upon express text. And this I am sure of, that neither I nor any man else is bound to believe anything as necessary to salvation, be it found in Councils, or Fathers, or where you will, if it be contrary to "express Scripture," or "necessary consequence" from it.[13] And for the copies of the Councils and Fathers which are in our hands, they are the same that are in the hands of the Romanists, and delivered to posterity by "tradition of the Church," which is abundantly sufficient to warrant that. So we are as infallibly sure of this, as it is possible for any of you to be. Nay, are we not more sure? For we have used no *Index Expurgatorius* upon the writings of the Fathers,[14]

tiam deducatur [Fides enim non est, nisi verbi divini auctoritate nitatur. Nothing can have the certainty of faith, unless it either be directly contained in the word of God, or be deduced as an evident consequence from the word of God; for it is not faith unless it rest on the authority of the divine Word.]—Bellarmin. *de Justificat.* lib. iii. cap. 8. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. iv. col. 963. B.]

[13] [Sed nunc] nec ego Nicænum nec tu debes Ariminense, tanquam præjudicaturus, proferre concilium. Nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris: Scripturarum auctoritatibus, [non quorumque propriis, sed utrisque communibus testibus,] res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet. [But now, neither ought I to bring forward the Council of Nicæa nor you the Council of Arimini, and so think to prejudge the question. I will not cling to the authority of the one nor you to the authority of the other. But under the authority of the Scripture which is a witness not belonging to either of us, but common to us both, let fact contend with fact, cause with cause, reason with reason.]—S. Augustin. *contra Maximinum* [*Arianum*,] lib. ii. cap. 14. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 704. F.]—Testimonia divina in fundamento ponenda sunt. [The divine evidence must be placed as the foundation.]—S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xx. cap. i. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 573. A. Migne, vii. 657.]—Eo quod principia hujus doctrinæ per revelationem habentur. [Et sic oportet, quod credatur auctoritati eorum, quibus revelatio facta est. Because the origin of this doctrine comes through revelation; and so we ought to believe the authority of those to whom the revelation was made.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] par. i. Q[uæst.] i. A[rtic.] 8, Respons. ad 2. [Migne, i. 467.]—Solis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam canonici appellantur, didici hunc [timorem] honorem[que] deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam. [Ac si aliquid in eis offendero literis, quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud, quam vel mendosum esse codicem, vel interpretem non assecutum esse quod dictum est, vel me minime intellexisse, non ambigam.] Alios autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem, quia ipsi ita senserunt, vel scripserunt. [I have learnt to pay such reverence and honour to the Scriptures which are already called canonical, and to these alone, that I must firmly believe no author among them has erred at all in what he wrote. And if in those books I were to come upon anything which appeared contrary to truth, I should not doubt that either the copy was faulty or the translator had not followed what was said or that I had failed to understand the passage. But other writers I read, however great the holiness and learning by which they are distinguished, not thinking them true, because they themselves thought so or so described themselves.]—S. Augustin. [*Epist.* lxxxii. ad Hieronymum, olim] Epist. xix. [§ 3. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 190. F. Migne, ii. 277.]

[14] [Primum enim toto Christianorum orbe conquiri nefariæ doctrinæ libros, et publice exuri jussisti: deinde expurgari, et emaculari curasti

[CHAPTER XIV.] as you have done; so that posterity hereafter must thank us for true copies both of Councils and Fathers, and not you.

A. C. p. 69. VII. But A. C. goes on, and asks still, "Whether Protestants be infallibly sure, that they rightly understand the sense of all which is expressed in their books, according to that which was understood by the primitive Church, and the Fathers which were present at the four first General Councils?" A. C. may ask everlastingly, if he will ask the same over and over again. For, I pray, wherein doth this differ from his first question,[15] save only that here Scripture is not named? For there the question was of our "assurance of the incorrupted sense." And therefore, thither I refer you for answer, with this, That it is not required either of us or of them, that there should be had an infallible assurance that we rightly understand the sense of all that is expressed in our books. And I think I may believe without sin, that there are many things expressed in these books, (for they are theirs as well as ours,) which A. C. and his fellows have not "infallible assurance" that they rightly understand in the sense of the primitive Church, or the Fathers present in those Councils. And if they say, Yes, they can, because when a difficulty crosses them, they believe them in the Church's sense; yet that dry shift will not serve. For belief of them in the Church's sense is an implicit faith, but it works nothing distinctly upon the understanding. For by an implicit faith, no man can be infallibly assured that he doth "rightly understand the sense"—which is A. C.'s question—whatever perhaps he may rightly believe. And an implicit faith and an infallible understanding of the same thing under the same considerations, cannot possibly stand together in the same man at the same time.

omnia Catholicorum scriptorum, ac præcipue veterum patrum scripta, hæreticorum ætatis nostræ fæcibus contaminata, et venenis infecta. Postremo Catalogum, vel Indicem, edi mandasti auctorum, ac librorum omnium hæretici nominis, qui essent ab ecclesiastica bibliotheca arcendi, et ab omnibus Christianis lectoribus abjiciendi. For first you have ordered books of bad doctrine to be searched for through the whole Christian world, and to be publicly burnt; then you have had every thing which had been spoilt by the dregs of the heretics of our age, and infected with poison expurgated and blotted out from the Catholic writings, and principally from the old fathers. Lastly, you have ordered a Catalogue or Index to be published of all the authors and books of heretical character which must be kept out of the Church libraries, and thrown away by all Christian readers.]—Sixtus Senensis, in Epist. [Dedicat.] ad Pium V. [præfix. *Bibliothec. Sanct.* p. 1. ed. Paris. 1610.]

[15] Sect. xxxviii. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 385.]

SECTION XXXVIII.

A. C. p. 69.

VIII. A. C. hath not done asking yet; but he would farther know, "Whether Protestants can be infallibly sure that all and only those points, which Protestants account fundamental and necessary to be expressly known by all, were so accounted by the primitive Church?" Truly, "unity in the faith" is very considerable in the Church. And in this the Protestants agree, and as uniformly as you; and have as "infallible assurance" as you can have, of all points which they account fundamental; yea, and of all which were so accounted by the Primitive Church. And these are but the Creed, and some few, and those immediate, deductions from it. And Tertullian[16] and Rufinus,[17] upon the very clause of the Catholic Church, to decipher it, make a recital only of the fundamental points of faith. And for the first of these, the Creed, you see what the sense of the Primitive Church was, by that famous and known place of Irenæus;[18] where, after he had recited the Creed as the epitome or brief of the faith, he adds, that "none of the governors of the Church, be they never so potent to express themselves, can say *alia ab his*, 'other things from these': nor none so weak in expression as to diminish this tradition. For since the faith is one and the same, he that can say much of it says no more than he ought, nor doth he diminish it that can say but little." And in this the Protestants all agree. And for the second, the "immediate deductions," they are not "formally fundamental" for all men, but for such[19] as are able to

[16] Tertullian. *de præscript. Hæreticor.* cap. xiii. etc. [*Op.*, p. 206. D. et seqq. ed. Rigalt. Migne, ii. 26.]

[17] Ruffin. *in Symbol.* [in appendic. ad *Op.*, S. Cypriani, p. ccxxiii. ed. Benedict.]

[18] Et neque qui valde potens est in dicendo ex ecclesiæ præfectis alia ab his dicet, etc. Neque debilis in dicendo hanc traditionem imminuet. Cum enim una et eadem fides sit, neque is, qui multum de ea dicere potest, plusquam oportet, dicit, neque qui parum, ipsam imminuit. [*καὶ οὔτε ὁ πάνυ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγῳ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πρωεστώτων, ἕτερα τουτῶν ἐρεῖ, (οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον) οὔτε ὁ ἀσθενὴς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἐλαττώσει τὴν παράδοσιν· μιᾶς γὰρ καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πιστέως οὔσης, οὔτε ὁ πολὺ περὶ αὐτῆς δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν, ἐπλεόνασεν, οὔτε ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον, ἠλαττόνησε.* And the most eloquent of the chiefs of the Church will not differ from this in what he says, for no one excels his Master; nor will the men weak at speaking diminish this tradition. For since the faith is one and the same, neither the man who can say much about it says more than he ought, nor does the man who says little diminish it.]—S. Irenæus, *advers. Hæres.* lib. i. [cap. 3. *ubi sup.* p. 34. note 8.]—Et, S. Basil. *Sermo de Fide.* [*Op.*,] tom. ii. p. 195. ed. Basil. 1505. [Migne, ii. 889.] [*φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις, κ.τ.λ.* A clear falling away, etc.—*ubi sup.* p. 62. note 1.]—Una et immobilis regula, etc. [a single and unalterable rule.]—Tertullian. *de Virg. veland.* cap. i. [*ubi sup.* p. 35. note 10.]

[19] Quantum [ergo] ad prima credibilia, quæ sunt articuli fidei, tenetur homo explicite credere, sicut et tenetur habere fidem. Quantum autem ad alia credibilia, non tenetur [homo] explicite credere, . . . quando hoc ei constiterit in doctrina fidei contineri.

[CHAPTER XIV.]

make or understand them. And for others, it is enough if they do not obstinately or schismatically refuse them, after they are once revealed. Indeed, you account many things fundamental, which were never so accounted in any sense by the Primitive Church; such as are all the decrees of General Councils, which may be all true, but can never be all "fundamental in the faith." For it is not in the power of the whole Church,[20] much less of a General Council, to make anything "fundamental in the faith," that is not contained in the letter or sense of that "common faith, which was once given," and but once for all, "to the saints." But if it be A. C.'s meaning, to call for an infallible assurance of all such points of faith as are decreed by General Councils, then I must be bold to tell him, all those decrees are not necessary to all men's salvation. Neither do the Romanists themselves agree in all such "determined points of faith," be they determined by Councils or by Popes. For instance: After those books which we account apocryphal were defined to be canonical,[21] and an anathema pronounced in the case, Sixtus Senensis[22] makes scruple

Jude 3.

[As to the first matters for belief, which are articles of faith, a man is bound to believe them explicitly, just as he is bound to have faith. As to the other matters for belief, he is not bound to believe them explicitly . . . till the time when it shall have been proved to him that each is contained in the doctrine of faith.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] ii. A[rtic.] 5. in conclus. [Migne, iii. 34.]—Credat errando contineri quoddam oppositum alicui articulo subtili, ad cujus fidem explicitam non omnes tenentur. [(It is not a sin of infidelity or heresy) . . . if he should believe by mistake that something opposite to any subtle article is contained in that article, for all are not bound to an explicit faith in such.] —[Magistri Roberti] Holkot. [super quatuor libros Sententiarum quæstiones, quædam conferentiæ,] in I. *Sentent.* Q[uæst.] i. Respons. ad 4. K. [ed. Lugd. 1497.]

[20] Resolutio Occham est, quod nec tota ecclesia, nec concilium generale, nec summus pontifex potest facere articulum, quod non fuit articulus. [Occham's decision is that neither the whole Church, nor a General Council, nor the supreme Pontiff can make into an article of faith what was not an article of faith.]—Almain. in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] unic. [fol. lxxx. *ubi supra*, p. 35. note 9.] —Articulus enim est ex eo solo, qui a Deo revelatus est. [For an article of faith comes only out of that which has been revealed by God.]—[*Ibid. paulo supra.*]

[21] [Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata Latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, et traditiones sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit. Should anyone not receive as sacred and canonical the whole of each Book with all its parts, in the form in which they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and are found in the old Latin Vulgate Edition, and should he knowingly and deliberately have despised them, let him be anathema.]—Concil. Tridentin. Sess. iv. [Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis.]

[22] [Ex. grat.: de Lib. *Esth.* Appendic. sic scribit Sixtus Senensis: Sed venit hoc loco in mentem, simul admonere, et adhortari pium ac benevolum lectorem, ne me temeritatis arguat, quod hæc septem postrema

of some of them. And after Pope Leo the Tenth[23] had defined the Pope to be above a General Council, yet many Roman Catholics[24] defend the contrary; and so do all the Sorbonists[25] at this very day. Therefore, if these be fundamental in the faith, the Romanists differ one from another in the faith—nay, in the fundamentals of the faith; and therefore cannot have infallible assurance of them. Nor is there that "unity in the faith" amongst them, which they so much and so often boast of. For "what Scripture is canonical," is a great point of faith. And I believe they will not now confess, that the pope's power over a General Council is a small one. And so let A. C. look to his own "infallible assurance" of fundamentals in the faith: for ours, God be thanked, is well. And since he is pleased to call for a "particular text of Scripture," to prove all and everything of this nature—which is ridiculous in itself, and unreasonable to demand, as hath been showed,[26]—yet when he shall be pleased to bring forth but a particular known tradition, to prove all and everything of this on their side, it will then be perhaps time for

capita, a canonicis Scripturis avulsa, in hunc ultimum apocryphorum ordinem redegerim, ac si oblitus sim decreti Sanctæ Synodi Tridentinæ . . . Est enim Canon ille intelligendus, de veris ac germanis partibus, quæ ad librorum integritatem spectant, non autem de laceris quibusdam appendicibus, et pannosis additamentis, a quovis incognito auctore temere appositis, et utcunque insutis, qualia sane sunt hujusmodi ultima capitula, etc. Thus writes Sixtus of Siena: "But at this point it comes to my mind at once to advise and to exhort my reverent and kindly readers, not to accuse me of rashness, for setting these seven last chapters (viz. of *Esther* as found in the Vulgate) in a place where they are torn away from the Canonical Scriptures, and set in this last rank of apocryphal books; as if I had forgotten the decree of the Holy Synod of Trent . . . For we must understand that Canon to be speaking about the true and genuine parts which actually belong to the books, and not about some maimed appendages and ragged additions, rashly added by some unknown author and joined on at some unknown time or other. And such these last chapters evidently are."]—Sixtus Senensis, *Biblioth. Sanct.* lib. i. [Sect. 3. p. 27. col. 2. D. p. 28. col. 1. A.]

[23] [Pope, 1513 to 1521, presided over later sessions of the Lateran Council, which was dissolved in 1517. In its 19th session it asserted the supremacy of the Pope over General Councils. This is used as an argument by Bellarmine. *De Concil.* lib. ii. cap. xvii. sect. 11.]

[24] Non est necessario credendum determinatis per sum[mum] pontificem, etc. [We are not obliged to believe the decisions of the Supreme Pontiff.] —Almain. in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxiv. Q[uæst.] unica Conclus. 6. Dub. 6. in fine. [Prop. 4. fol. lxxvii.]

[25] [The Sorbonne was the name given to the Faculty of Theology in the University of Paris. It was so called from St. Louis' (Louis IX.) Chaplain, Robert de Sorbon, a very holy man. It was established in 1255, and sanctioned by Pope Alexander IV. in 1259. It exercised an immense influence on Theology and Religion in France; and had much to do with the councils of Constance and of Basel.]

[26] Sect. xxxviii. No. 6. [*vide supra*, p. 386.]

[CHAPTER XIV.] him to call for, and for us to give, farther answer about particular texts of Scripture.

A. C. p. 69. IX. After all this questioning, A. C. infers: "That I had need seek out some other infallible rule and means, by which I may know these things infallibly; or else that I have no reason to be so confident as to adventure my soul, that one may be saved living and dying in the Protestant faith." How weak this inference is, will easily appear by that which I have already said to the premises; and yet I have somewhat left to say to this inference also. And first: I have lived, and shall, God willing, die, in the faith of Christ, as it was professed in the ancient Primitive Church, and as it is professed in the present Church of England. And for the rule which governs me herein, if I cannot be confident for my soul upon the Scripture, and the Primitive Church expounding and declaring it, I will be confident upon no other. And, secondly, I have all the reason in the world to be confident upon this rule, for this can never deceive me: A. C. p. 72. another, that very other which A. C. proposes, namely, "the faith of the Roman Church" may. Therefore, with A. C.'s leave, I will venture my salvation upon the rule aforesaid, and not trouble myself to seek another of man's making, to the forsaking or weakening of this which God hath given me. For I know they Jer. ii. 13. "committed two evils, which forsook the fountain of living waters, to hew out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." For here is the evil of desertion of that which was right; and the evil of a bad choice—of that which is hewed out with much pains and care, and is after useless and unprofitable. But then, thirdly, I find that a Romanist may make use of an implicit faith at his pleasure, but a Protestant must "know" all these things "infallibly"; that is A. C.'s word, "know these things." Why, but is it not enough to believe them? Now God [Inserted in Edit. 1673.] forbid [it should; else,] what shall become of millions of poor Christians in the world, which cannot "know" all these things, much less know them "infallibly"? Well, I would not have A. C. weaken the belief of poor Christians in this fashion. But for things that may be known as well as believed, nor I, nor any other, shall need forsake the Scripture, to seek another rule to direct either our conscience or our confidence.

A. C. p. 69. X. In the next place, A. C. observes, "that the Jesuit was as confident for his part, with this difference, that he had sufficient reason of his confidence, but I had not for mine." This is said

with the confidence of a Jesuit, but as yet but said. Therefore he goes on, and tells us, "that the Jesuit had reason of his confidence out of express Scriptures, and Fathers, and the infallible authority of the Church." Now, truly, "express scriptures"; with A. C.'s patience, he hath not named one that is "express," nor can he. And the few scriptures which he hath alleged, I have answered,[27] and so have others. As for "Fathers," he has named very few, and with what success, I leave to the reader's judgment. And for the "authority of the Catholic Church," I hold it[28] as "infallible," as he, and upon better grounds; but not so of a General Council, which he here means, as appears after. And, for my part, I must yet think, and I doubt A. C. will not be able to disprove it, that "express Scripture," and "Fathers," and the "authority of the Church," will rather be found proofs to warrant my confidence than his. Yea, but A. C. saith, "that I did not then tax the Jesuit with any rashness." It may be so; nor did he me: so there we parted even. Yea, but he saith again, that I "acknowledge there is but one saving faith, and that the Lady might be saved in the Roman faith, which was all the Jesuit took upon his soul." Why, but if this be all, I will confess it again. The first, That there is but one faith, I confess with St. Paul. And the other, That the Lady might be saved in the Roman faith, or Church,[29] I confess with that charity which St. Paul teacheth me —namely, to leave all men, especially the weaker both sex and sort, which hold the foundation, to "stand or fall to their own Master." And this is no "mistaken charity." As for the inference which you would draw out of it, that is answered at large already.[30] But then A. C. adds, "that I say, but without any proof, that the Romanists have many dangerous errors, but that I neither tell them which they be, nor why I think them dangerous, but that I leave them to look to their own souls; which," he says, "they do, and have no cause to doubt." How much the Jesuit and A. C. have said in this Conference without any solid proof, I again submit to judgment, as also what proofs I have made. If in this very place I have added none, it is because I had made proof enough of the selfsame thing before;[31] where, lest he should want

SECTION XXXVIII.

A. C. p. 70.

A. C. p. 71.

A. C. p. 70.

Ephes. iv. 5.

Rom. xiv. 4.

A. C. p. 70.

[27] Sect. xxv. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 186.] Sect. xxxiii. Consid. iii. No. 1. [*vide supra*, p. 266.]

[28] Sect. xxi. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 157.]

[29] Sect. xxxiv. [*vide supra*, p. 332.]

[30] [Sect. xxxv. No. 2. [*vide supra*, p. 335.]

[31] [Sect. xxxiii. [Consid. vii.] No. 12. [*vide supra*, p. 318.] Sect. xxxv. No. 7. [*vide supra*, p. 355.]

[CHAPTER XIV.]

and call for proof again, I have plainly laid together some of the many "dangerous errors" which are charged upon them. So I tell you which, at least some of which, they be; and their very naming will show their danger. And if I did remit you to look to your own souls, I hope there was no offence in that, if you do it, and do it so that you have no cause to doubt. And the reason why you doubt not, A. C. tells us, is, "because you had no new device of your own, or any other men's, nor anything contrary to Scripture, but all most conformable to Scriptures interpreted by unanime[32] consent of Fathers, and definitions of Councils." Indeed, if this were true, you had little cause to doubt in point of your belief. But the truth is, you do hold new devices of your own, which the Primitive Church was never acquainted with; and some of those, so far from being conformable, as that they are little less than contradictory, to Scripture; in which particulars, and divers others, the Scriptures are not interpreted by "unanime consent of Fathers," or "definitions of Councils,"—unless, perhaps, by some late Councils, packed of purpose to do that ill service. I have given instances enough before,[33] yet some you shall have here, lest you should say again that I affirm without proof or instance.[34] I pray, then, whose device was Transubstantiation[35] —and whose, Communion under One Kind—and whose, deposition and unthroning, nay killing, of princes,[36] and the like—if

A. C. p. 70.

[32] [In the text of all the three Editions, these words as cited, and correctly, by Laud, are "by union, consent of Fathers," etc., but in the table of errata A. C. had corrected the phrase as given in the present text, "unanime consent," etc.]

[33] [Sect. xxxiii. [Consid. vii.] No. 12. [*vide supra*, p. 318.] Sect. xxxv. No. 7. [*vide supra*, p. 355.]

[34] [Conc. Lateran. [IV.] Can. i. [*ubi supra*, p. 320. note 38.]

[35] [Conc. Constant. Sess. xiii. [*ubi supra*, p. 302. note 126.]

[36] Propter hæresim [regis,] non solum rex regno privatur, sed et ejus filii a regni successione pelluntur: [ut noster Lupus (*de jure naturæ*, part v. § 7.) luculenter probat: ergo primogenita pari ratione confiscari possunt. For a king's heresy, not only is that king deprived of his kingdom, but further his sons lose their succession to his kingdom; as our friend Lupus proves clearly; therefore with equal reason the rights of primogeniture can be confiscated.]—[Jacobi] Simancæ, [Pacensis Episcopi], *de Catholicis Institutionibus* [lib.] tit. ix. [*de bonis hæreticorum*,] § 259. [p. 77. ed. Romæ, 1575.]—[Item] absoluti sunt a debito fidelitatis, [dominii et omnis obsequii, quicunque lapsis manifeste in hæresim, aliquo pacto, quacunque firmitate vallato, tenebantur astricti: quemadmodum Gregorius IX. constituit.] Custodes arcium, [et quicunque vasalli eadem constitutione liberati sunt a vinculo sacramenti, quo dominis fidelitatem promiserant. Further every man is absolved from his obligation of fidelity, of vassalage and every form of obedience, if the lord to whom he is bound has fallen into open heresy—whatever their compact was, and however strongly hedged in: —as Gregory IX. decreed. The governors of forts, and all other vassals are freed by the same decree from the bond of their oath, by which

they were not yours? For I dare say, and am able to prove, there is none of these but are rather contrary, than conformable, to Scripture. Neither is A. C., or any Jesuit, able to show any Scripture, interpreted by "unanime[37] consent of Fathers of the Primitive Church,"[38] to prove any one of these; nor any "definition

SECTION XXXVIII.

A. C. p. 70.

they had promised fidelity to their lord.]—*Id.* tit. xlvi. [*de pœnis,*] § 73. [p. 371.]—It was stiffly avowed not long since by———, That no man could show any one Roman Catholic of note and learning that affirmed it lawful to kill kings upon any pretext whatsoever. Now surely he that says, as Romanists do, that it is lawful to depose a king, says upon the matter it is lawful to kill him; for kings do not use to be long-lived after their deposition; and they seldom stay till grief breaks their hearts; they have Assassinates ready to make shorter work. But since he is so confident, I will give him an author of note, and very learned, that speaks it out: si juberet colere idola, vel deserere legem Dei: [certum est enim quod non erat sibi obediendum; immo ipse] rex deberet occidi, si ad talia solicitaret populum.—[Supposing he should command (his people) to worship idols, or to abandon God's Law, it is certain he ought not to be obeyed; yea a king ought to be killed, if he should persuade his people to such doings.]—Tostatus, in *2 Sam.* [*2 Reg.*] xi. Quæst. 17. [*Op.*, tom. vi. par 3. p. 109. D. ed. Col. Agrip. 1613.] And he makes bold with Scripture to prove it. *Deut.* xiii. [9]. And Emmanuel Sa, in his *Aphorisms*, (*verb.* Tyrannus,) yet he is so moderate that he would not have this done till he be sentenced: but then, Quisquis potest fieri executor. [Anyone can execute the sentence.—*Aphorismi Confessariorum ex doctorum sententiis collecti*: autore Emanuele Sa, Lusitano, etc., p. 611, ed. Colon. 1615: et p. 308. ed. Antverp. 1599.] Mariana is far worse: for he says it is lawful to kill him, postquam a paucis seditiosis sed doctis cœperit tyrannus appellari. [After he has been named tyrant by even a few rebels, always supposing they are learned men.]——[Joannis] Marianæ, [Hispani,] *de Rege et Regis Institutione* [libri. iii. *ad Philippum III. Hispaniæ regem*, etc.] Lib. i. cap. 6. [p. 60. ed. (secund.) Francof. (?) 1611.] Yea, but Mariana was disclaimed for this by the Jesuits. [Cf. *Antimariana: ou, Refutation des Propositions de Mariana*, etc., par M. Roussel; (this work contains the decree of the Sorbonne against Mariana,) à Paris, 1610.] Yea, but for all that, there was an Apology printed in Italy, an. 1610. permissu superiorum. And there it is said, They were all enemies of the holy name of Jesus that condemned Mariana for any such doctrine. As for Tostatus, no sentence hath touched upon him at all for it.

[37] Corpus Christi veraciter esse in eucharistia, ex evangelio habemus. Quod evangelium non explicavit expresse, ab ecclesia accepimus, scilicet conversionem panis in corpus Christi. [Hanc enim non solum a priscis doctoribus ecclesiæ habemus, quos habes, *de consecr.* Dist. ii. copiose, et a Magistro Sentent. in tract. *de euch.* diffuse; sed a Conc. Lateranensi sub Innocent III. ut patet *extrav.* de Summa Trin. et fid. cath. *firmiter credimus.* That the body of Christ is truly in the Eucharist . . . we receive from the Gospel. . . . What the Gospel has not explicitly unfolded we have received from the Church, I mean the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ. For we receive this not only from the ancient doctors of the Church whom you find quoted abundantly (*De Consecr.* Dist. ii. etc.), and at length by the Master of the Sentences, but from the Council of the Lateran under Innocent III. as you will find recounted.]—Cajetan. in S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.* par.] iii. Quæst. lxxv. Artic. 1. [tom. viii. p. 360. ed. Romæ, 1773.]

[38] De transubstantiatione panis in corpus Christi rara est in antiquis scriptoribus mentio; [de processione Spiritus Sancti a Filio multo rarior; de purgatorio fere nulla, potissimum apud Græcos scriptores, qua de causa usque in hodiernum diem purgatorium non est a Græcis creditum. Of the transubstantiation of the Bread

[CHAPTER XIV.] of ancient Councils," but only Lateran for Transubstantiation,[39] and that of Constance for the Eucharist in One Kind;[40] which two are modern at least, far downward from the Primitive Church; and have done more mischief to the Church by those their determinations, than will be cured, I fear, in many generations. So, whatever A. C. thinks, yet I had reason enough to leave the Jesuit to look to his own soul.

A. C. p. 70. XI. But A. C. having, as it seems, little new matter, is at the same again, and over and over it must go: "That there is but one saving faith; that this one faith was once the Roman; and that I granted one might be saved in the Roman faith." To all which I have abundantly answered before.[41] Marry, then he infers, "That he sees not how we can have our souls saved, without we entirely hold this faith, being the Catholic faith, which, St. Athanasius saith, 'unless a man hold entirely, he cannot be saved.'" Now here again is more in the conclusion than in the premises; and so the inference fails. For say there was a time in which the Catholic and the Roman faith were one—and such
Rom. i. 8. a time there was, when the Roman faith was catholic, and famous through the world—yet it does not follow, since the Council of Trent hath added a new Creed,[42] that this Roman faith is now the Catholic; for it hath added *extranea*, "things without the foundation," disputable, if not false, conclusions to the faith. So that now a man may believe the whole and entire Catholic faith, even as St. Athanasius requires, and yet justly refuse for dross a great part of that which is now the Roman faith.[43] And Athanasius

into Christ's Body you will find little in the ancient writers, much less about the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, almost nothing about Purgatory, and specially in the Greek Fathers. Therefore to this day the Greeks do not believe in purgatory.]—Alphonsus a Castro, [Minorita,] *advers. Hæres.* lib. viii. (*verb.* Indulgentiæ,) [fol. cxlii. *v.* E. ed. Colon. 1539.]

[39] Conc. Lateran. Can. i. [*ubi supra*, p. 320. note 38.]

[40] Conc. Constant. Sess. xiii. [*ubi supra*, p. 302. note 126.]

[41] Sect. xxxv. No. 1. and Sect. xxxviii. No. 10. [*vide supra*, p. 332, and p. 392.]

[42] [Concil. Trident. Bulla Pii IV. super forma juramenti professionis fidei, ad finem Concil. Trident.]

[43] And this is so much the more remarkable, if it be true which Thomas hath: Athanasius non composuit manifestationem fidei per modum *Symboli*, sed per modum *doctrinæ*. Sed quia integram fidei veritatem ejus doctrina breviter continebat, auctoritate summi pontificis est recepta, ut quasi regula fidei habeatur. [Athanasius did not compose his declaration of faith in the form of a creed but in the form of doctrinal teaching. . . . But because this doctrinal teaching contained in a short form the whole truth of the faith, it has been received by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, and treated as a rule of faith.] —S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] 1. A[rtic.] 10. Respons. ad 3.—[Migne, iii. 27.]—[Huic autem] symbolo Apostolorum addita sunt duo alia; scilicet Symbolum Nicæni Concilii et Symbolum

himself, as if he meant to arm the Catholic faith against all corrupting additions, hath in the beginning of his Creed[44] these words: "This is the Catholic faith," this and no other: this, and no other, then, here follows. And again at the end of his Creed, "This is the Catholic faith";[45] this, and no more[46] than is here delivered, (always presupposing the Apostles' Creed as Athanasius did), and this is the largest of all Creeds. So that if A. C. would wipe his eyes from the mist which rises about Tiber, he might see how our souls may be saved, believing the Catholic faith, and that entire, without the addition of Roman leaven. But if he cannot, or, I doubt, will not see it, it is enough that, by God's grace, we see it: and therefore once more I leave him and his to look to their own souls.

SECTION XXXVIII.

XII. After this, A. C. is busy in unfolding the meaning of this great Father of the Church, St. Athanasius. And he tells us, "that he says in his Creed, that, 'without doubt every man shall perish that holds not the Catholic faith entire,' (that is," saith A. C. "in every point of it), 'and inviolate,' (that is, in the right sense, and for the true formal reason of Divine revelation, sufficiently applied to our understanding by the infallible authority of the Catholic Church proposing to us by her pastors this revelation)." Well, we shall not differ much from A. C. in expounding the meaning of St. Athanasius; yet some few things I shall here observe. And, first, I agree, that he which hopes for salvation, must believe the Catholic faith whole and entire in every point. Next, I agree, that he must likewise hold it inviolate, if to believe it in the right sense be to hold it inviolate. But, by A. C.'s leave, the believing of the Creed in the right sense is comprehended in the first branch—"the keeping of it

A. C. p. 70.

Athanasii, ad majorem fidei explanationem, [et hæresum confutationem. Athanasii ordinatum contra errorem Arrii.] [Now to this Apostles' creed have been added two others: the Creed of the Council of Nicæa, and the Creed of Athanasius, for the fuller explanation of the faith, and confutation of heresies. The creed of Athanasius was formed against the error of Arius.]—[Gab.] Biel. in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] unic. A[rtic.] 1. [Not. I.] D.

[44] *S. Athanas. in Symbol.*

[45] And yet the Council of Trent having added twelve new articles, says thus of them also: Hæc est vera Catholica fides, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, etc.—[This is the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved.]—Bulla Pii IV. super forma juramenti professionis fidei, in fine Concil. Trident. [See the Bull of Pius IV. above the form for an oath of confession of faith, at the end of the Council of Trent's decrees.]

[46] Integram fidei veritatem ejus doctrina breviter continet.—[His doctrine briefly contains the whole truth of the faith.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] 1. A[rtic.] 10. [Respons.] ad 3. [*ubi supra*, note 42.] [Migne, iii. 27.]

[CHAPTER XIV.]

whole and entire." For no man can properly be said to believe the whole Creed, that believes not the whole sense as well as the letter of it, and as entirely. But, thirdly, for the word "inviolate," it is, indeed, used by him that translated Athanasius; but the Father's own words are: "that he that will be saved must keep the faith ὑγιῇ καὶ ἄμωμον." Now ὑγιὴς is the "sound and entire" faith. And it cannot be a sound faith, unless the sense be as whole and entire as the letter of the Creed. And ἄμωμος is compounded of the privative particle ἀ, and μῶμος, which is, "reproach" or "infamy": so that ἄμωμος signifies the holding of the entire faith in such holiness of life and conversation, as is "without all infamy and reproach." That is, as our English renders that Creed exceeding well: "Which faith unless a man do keep whole and undefiled,"[47] even with such a life as Momus himself shall not be able to carp at. So Athanasius,—who certainly was passing able to express himself in his own language,—in the beginning of that his Creed requires, that we keep it "entire," without diminution: and "undefiled," without blame: and at the end, that we believe it "faithfully," without wavering. But "inviolate" is the mistaken word of the old interpreter, and with no great knowledge made use of by A. C. And then, fourthly, though this be true divinity, That he which hopes for salvation must believe the whole Creed—and in the right sense, too, if he be able to comprehend it,—yet I take the true and first meaning of "inviolate,"—could Athanasius's word ἄμωμος have signified so,—not to be the holding of the true sense, but not to offer violence, or a forced sense or meaning, upon the Creed, which every man doth not that yet believes it not in a true sense; for, not to believe the true sense of the Creed is one thing, but it is quite another to force a wrong sense upon it. Fifthly: a reason would be given also why A. C. is so earnest for "the whole faith," and balks the word which goes with it, which is "holy or undefiled"; for Athanasius doth alike exclude from

[47] Sic Ecclesia dicitur ἄμωμος, *Eph.* v. 27; et in veteri Glossario, ἄμωμος, immaculatus. [So the Church is called ἄμωμος (blameless) *Eph.* v. 27; and in the old Glossary ἄμωμος is translated spotless. Four Greek versions—or forms—of the Athanasian Creed are preserved in the Benedictine edition of St. Athan. *Op.*, tom. ii. pp. 728—731. Migne, iv. 1581 *et seq.* The respective readings of this clause, are, (1.) ἣν εἰ μή τις ὑγιῇ καὶ ἄμωμον· (2.) ἀκεραίον καὶ ἀπαράθραυστον· (3.) σῶον καὶ ἀμώμητον· (4.) ἀμόλυντον καὶ ἄφθορον· (1.) Which unless a man keep whole and blameless; (2.) unmixed and unbroken; (3.) safe and blameless; (4.) undefiled and uncorrupted.]

salvation those which keep not the Catholic faith "holy," as well as these which keep it not "whole." I doubt this was to spare many of his "holy fathers, the popes,"[48] who were as far as any—the very lewdest among men without exception—from keeping the Catholic faith holy. Sixthly: I agree to the next part of his exposition, "That a man that will be saved must believe the whole Creed for the true formal reason of Divine revelation"; for upon the truth of God, thus revealed by Himself, lies the "infallible certainty" of the Christian faith. But I do not grant that this is within the compass of St. Athanasius's word ἄμωμος, nor of the word "inviolate"; but in that respect it is a mere strain of A. C. And then, lastly, though the whole Catholic Church be sufficient in applying this to us and our belief, not our understanding, which A. C. is at again, yet "infallible" she is not, in the proposal of this revelation to us by every of her pastors; some whereof amongst you, as well as others, neglect, or forget at least, to feed Christ's sheep as Christ and His Church hath fed them.

SECTION XXXVIII.

A. C. p. 70.

XIII. But now that A. C. hath taught us, as you see, the meaning of St. Athanasius, in the next place he tells us, "That if we did believe any one article, we, finding the same formal reason in all, and applied sufficiently by the same means to all, would easily believe all." Why, surely, we do not believe any one article only, but all the articles of the Christian faith; and we believe them for the same formal reason in all—namely, Because they are revealed from and by God, and sufficiently applied in His word, and by His Church's ministration. "But so long as they do not believe all in this sort," saith A. C. Look you; he tells us we do not believe all, when we profess we do. Is this man become as God, that he can better tell what we believe than we ourselves? Surely we do believe all, and in that sort too; though, I believe, were St. Athanasius himself alive again, and a plain man should come to him and tell him he believed his Creed in all and every particular, he would admit him for a good Catholic Christian, though he were not able to express to him the formal reason of that his belief. "Yea, but," saith A. C., "while they will, as all heretics do, make choice of what they will, and what they will not, believe, without relying upon the infallible authority of the Catholic Church, they cannot have that one saving faith in any one article." Why, but whatsoever heretics do, we are not such, nor do we so; for they which believe all the articles—as

A. C. p. 70.

A. C. p. 70.

A. C. p. 70.

[48] Sect. xxxiii. [Consid. vii.] No. 7. [*vide supra*, p. 307.]

[CHAPTER XIV.] once again I tell you we do—make no choice; and we do rely upon the infallible authority of the word of God, and the whole Catholic Church; and therefore we both can have, and have, that "one saving faith" which believes all the articles entirely, though we cannot believe that any particular Church is infallible.

A. C. p. 71. XIV. And yet, again, A. C. will not thus be satisfied, but on he goes, and adds: "That although we believe the same truth which other good Catholics do in some articles, yet not believing them for the same formal reason of Divine revelation, sufficiently applied by infallible Church authority, etc., we cannot be said to have one and the same infallible and Divine faith which other good Catholic Christians have, who believe the articles for this formal reason, sufficiently made known to them, not by their own fancy, nor the fallible authority of human deductions, but by the infallible authority of the Church of God." If A. C. will still say the same thing, I must still give the same answer. First, he confesses we believe the same truth in "some articles,"—I pray, mark his phrase,—the same truth in some articles with "other good Catholic Christians." So far his pen hath told truth against his will: for he doth not, I wot well, intend to call us Catholics, and yet his pen, being truer than himself, hath let it fall; for the word "other" cannot be so used as here it is, but that we, as well as they, must be good Catholics: for he that shall say the old Romans were valiant as well as other men, supposes the Romans to be valiant men; and he that shall say the Protestants believe some articles as well as "other good Catholics," must, in propriety of speech, suppose them to be good Catholics. Secondly, as we do believe those "some articles," so do we believe them, and all other articles of faith, "for the same formal reason, and so applied," as but just before I have expressed.[49] Nor do we believe any one article of faith by our own "fancy," or by
A. C. p. 71. "fallible authority" of human deductions; but, next to the infallible authority of God's word, we are guided by His Church. But then A. C. steps into a conclusion whither we cannot follow him; for he says, "that the articles to be believed must be sufficiently made known unto us by the infallible authority of the Church of God—that is, of men infallibly assisted by the Spirit of God, as all lawfully called, continued, and confirmed General Councils are assisted." That the whole Church

[49] Sect. xxxviii. No. 13. [*vide supra*, p. 399.]

of God is infallibly assisted by the Spirit of God,[50] so that it cannot by any error fall away totally from Christ the foundation, I make no doubt; for if it could, "the gates of hell" had "prevailed against it": which, our Saviour assures me, they shall never be able to do. But that all General Councils, be they never so "lawfully called, continued, and confirmed," have "infallible assistance," I utterly deny. It is true that a General Council *de post facto*, "after it is ended," and admitted by the whole Church, is then infallible; for it cannot err in that which it hath already clearly and truly determined without error. But that a General Council, *a parte ante*, when it first sits down and continues to deliberate, may truly be said to be infallible in all its after-determinations, whatsoever they shall be, I utterly deny. And it may be it was not without cunning that A. C. shuffled these words together—"called," "continued," and "confirmed"; for, be it never so lawfully "called" and "continued," it may err. But after it is "confirmed," that is, admitted by the whole Church, then, being found true, it is also infallible; that is, it deceives no man. For so all truth is, and is to us, when it is once known to be truth; but then many times that truth, which being known is necessary and infallible, was before both contingent and fallible in the way of proving it, and to us. And so here, a General Council is a most probable, but yet a fallible, way of inducing truth, though the truth once induced may be, after it is found, necessary and infallible. And so likewise the very Council itself, for that particular in which it hath concluded truth. But A. C. must both speak and mean of a Council set down to deliberate, or else he says nothing.

SECTION XXXVIII.

Matt. xvi. 18.

XV. Now hence A. C. gathers, "That though every thing defined to be a Divine truth, in General Councils, is not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed," as some other truths are, "by all sorts: yet no man may," after knowledge that they are thus defined, "doubt deliberately, much less obstinately deny the truth of any thing so defined." Well, in this collection of A. C., first, we have this granted, That every thing defined in General Councils is not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed by all sorts of men. And this no Protestant, that I know, denies. Secondly, it is affirmed, that, after knowledge that these truths are thus defined, no man may "doubt deliberately," much less "obstinately deny"

A. C. p. 71.

[50] Sect. xxi. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 156.]

[CHAPTER XIV.]

any of them. Truly, "obstinately," as the word is now in common use, carries a fault along with it. And it ought to be far from the temper of a Christian to be "obstinate" against the definitions of a General Council. But that he may not upon very probable grounds, in an humble and peaceable manner, "deliberately doubt," yea, and upon demonstrative grounds, "constantly deny," even "such definitions," yet submitting himself and his grounds to the Church in that or another Council, is that which was never till now imposed upon believers. For it is one thing for a man deliberately to doubt, and modestly to propose his doubt for satisfaction, which was ever lawful, and is many times necessary; and quite another thing for a man, upon the pride of his own judgment, to refuse external obedience to the Council,[51] which to do was never lawful, nor can ever stand with any government; for there is all the reason in the world the Council should be heard for itself, as well as any such recusant whatsoever, and that before a judge as good as itself at least. And to what end did St. Augustine say, "that one General Council might be amended by another, the former by the later,[52] if men might neither "deny," nor so much as "deliberately doubt" of, any of these truths defined in a General Council? And A. C. should have done well to have named but one ancient Father of the Primitive Church that ever affirmed this. For the assistance which God gives to the whole Church in general[53] is but in things simply necessary to eternal salvation; therefore more than this cannot be given to a General Council, no, nor so much. But then, if a General Council shall forget itself, and take upon it to define things not absolutely necessary to be expressly known or actually believed (which are the things which A. C. here speaks of), in these, as neither General Council nor the whole Church have infallible assistance, so have Christians liberty, modestly and peaceably, and upon just grounds, both deliberately to doubt and constantly to deny such the Council's definitions. For instance: the Council of Florence first defined purgatory to be believed as a divine truth, and matter of faith—if that Council had "consent" enough so to define it.[54] This was afterwards deliberately doubted

[51] Sect. xxxii. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 262.]

[52] Ipsaque plenaria, sæpe priora a posterioribus emendari. [And among those General Councils, often the later have amended the earlier.]—S. Augustin. *de Bapt. cont. Donat.* lib. ii. cap. 3 [*ubi supra*, p. 279. note 50. Migne, ix. 129.]

[53] Sect. xxi. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 156.]

[54] I know the Greeks subscribed that Council. [Sæpius de purgatorio

of by the Protestants; after this, as constantly denied; then confirmed by the Council of Trent,[55] and an anathema set upon the head of every man that denies it: and yet scarce any Father within the first three hundred years ever thought of it.

XVI. I know Bellarmine affirms it boldly, "That all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, did constantly teach purgatory, from the very Apostles' times."[56] And where he brings his proofs out of the Fathers for this point, he divides them into two ranks. In the first, he reckons them which affirm prayer for the dead—as if that must necessarily infer purgatory.[57] Whereas, most certain it is that the ancients had, and gave, other reasons of prayer for the dead than freeing them out of any purgatory. And this is very learnedly and at large set down by the now learned Primate of Armagh.[58] But then, in the second, he says there are "most

dubitatum est;] et illi Græca Ecclesia in Concilio Florentino diu restitit. [There has very often been a doubt about purgatory, and at the Council of Florence the Greek Church long opposed it.]—Pet. Martyr. *Loc. Commun.* Class iii. cap. ix. § 13. [p. 437. col. 2. B. ed. Genev. 1624.]—Et in ultima sessione istius Concilii Græci dixerunt, se, sine auctoritate totius Ecclesiæ Orientalis, quæstionem aliam tractare non posse, præter illam de processione Sp. Sancti. Postea vero, consentiente imperatore, tractarunt de aliis, etc. [And in the last session of the Council the Greeks said that they could not treat any question, except that of the procession of the Holy Spirit, without the consent of the whole Eastern Church. But afterwards, with the Emperor's consent, they did treat other questions.]—Florent. Concil. sess. ult. apud Nicolinum, tom. iv. p. 894, etc. [*χρὴ τελειῶσαι καὶ τὰ ἑπόμενα . . . τὸ τῆς καθαρτηρίου . . . ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς·* (sc. Græci) *Ἡμεῖς ἄδειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς συνόδου ἀποκριθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἰδίως ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν ἀπολογούμεθα, κ.τ.λ.*—It is necessary to finish also the following matters . . . the question of purgatory. The chief priests (Greeks) answered, We have no license from the Eastern Church to answer, but as private persons and for ourselves we reply.—Concil. Florentin. in Sess. xxv. apud Concil. tom. xiii. col. 496. E.] This savours of some art to bring in the Greeks. Howsoever this shows enough against Bellarmine, that all the Greeks did not constantly teach purgatory, as he affirms: *de Purgatorio*, lib. i. cap. 15. § 14. [*vide infra*, note 56.]

[55] Conc. Trid. Sess. xxv. et in Bulla Pii IV. super forma Juramenti Professionis Fidei.

[56] De tertio modo, [perspicuum est ex eo, quod non invenimus initium hujus dogmatis, sed] omnes veteres Græci et Latini ab ipso tempore Apostolorum constanter docuerunt purgatorium esse. [About the third method; It is quite certain, because we have not found the origin of this dogma, but all the old Greek and Latin Fathers from the very time of the Apostles, continuously taught the doctrine of purgatory.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgatorio*, lib. i. cap. 15. § 14. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 625. C.]

[57] [Primus ex patribus, Clemens, lib. viii. *Constitut.* cap. 47. longam orationem describit pro defunctis fieri solitam. Clement, the first of the Fathers (lib. viii. etc.) describes that a long prayer was regularly made for the dead.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgator.* lib. i. cap. 10. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 604. B.]

[58] [James Ussher, born in 1580, Archbishop of Armagh 1624, died in 1656. He was a great friend of Laud.]

["Our Romanists indeed do commonly take it for granted, that 'Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead be so closely linked together, that the one doth necessarily follow the other': but

[CHAPTER XIV.]

manifest places in the Fathers, in which they affirm purgatory."[59] And he names there no fewer than two-and-twenty of the Fathers. A great jury, certainly, did they give their verdict with him. But, first, within the three hundred years after Christ, he names none but Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen. And Tertullian speaks expressly of hell, not of purgatory;[60] St. Cyprian, of a purging to amendment, which cannot be after this life.[61] As for Origen,[62] he, I think indeed, was the first founder of purgatory, but of such an one as I believe Bellarmine dares not affirm; for he "thought there was no punishment after this life but purgatory; and that not only the most impious men, but even the devils themselves, should be saved after they had suffered and been purged enough";[63] which is directly contrary to the word of God

in so doing, they reckon without their host, and greatly mistake the matter . . . they shall never be able to show, that the commemoration and prayers for the dead, used by the ancient Church, had any relation unto their purgatory," etc.]—Jacob. Ussher, Armachan. [Archiepis.] in his *Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit*, [W. Malone,] chap. vii. p. 194. [*Works*, vol. iii. p. 198. ed. 1847.]

[59] [Deinde] sunt apertissima loca in patribus, ubi asserunt purgatorium. [Next, there are the clearest passages in the fathers where they assert purgatory.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgat.* lib. i. cap. 10. § 20. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 607. B.]

[60] [Et judex te tradat angelo executionis, et ille te in carcerem mandet] infernum, [unde non dimittaris, nisi modico quoque delicto mora resurrectionis expenso. And the Judge deliver thee to the angel of execution, and he cast thee into the prison of hell, from which thou shalt not be released, until a considerable penalty has been paid in the delay of your resurrection.] — Tertullian. lib. *de Anima*, cap. xvii. [cap. xxxv. p. 291. B. ed. Rigalt. Migne, ii. 712.]

[61] [Aliud est ad veniam stare, aliud ad gloriam pervenire, aliud missum in carcerem non exire inde donec solvat novissimum quadrantem, aliud statim fidei et virtutis accipere mercedem, aliud pro peccatis longo dolore cruciatum] emundari [et purgari diu] igne, [aliud peccata omnia passione purgasse, aliud denique pendere in diem judicii ad sententiam Domini, aliud statim a Domino coronari. It is one thing to be forgiven, another thing to attain glory; yet another to be sent into prison and not to get out thence until you have paid the uttermost farthing; another thing to receive at once the reward of faith and virtue; another, after being tortured in long pain for your sins, to be cleansed and long purged by fire; another thing to have purged away all your sins by suffering, another thing to wait till the day of judgment for the Lord's sentence; another thing to be crowned at once by the Lord. (Bellarmine's reading is: pro peccatis longo *tempore* (long time) cruciatum.)]—S. Cyprian. [*Epist.* iii. *ad Antonianum de Concilio et Novatiano*, olim] lib. iv. Epist. 2. [p. 72. ed. Benedict.]

[62] [Belonged to the School of Alexandria; lived 185 to 254 A.D.]

[63] [The passage quoted by Bellarmine from Origen in favour of purgatory is: Veniendum est ergo omnibus ad ignem, veniendum est ad conflatorium. Sedet enim Dominus, et conflat, et purgat filios Judæ. (*Malach.* iii. 3.) Sed et illuc cum venitur, si quis multa opera bona, et parum aliquid iniquitatis attulerit, illud parum tanquam plumbum igni resolvitur ac purgatur, et totum remanet aurum purum. Therefore we must all come to the fire, we must all come to the furnace. For the Lord sits and heats the furnace, and purges the sons of Judah (*Malachi* iii. 3). But when we come to it, if any one

expounded by his Church.[64] In the fourth and fifth, the great and learned ages of the Church, he names more, as St. Ambrose. But St. Ambrose[65] says, that some shall be saved *quasi per ignem*,

has brought many good works, and very little wickedness, that little is melted like lead at the fire and purged; and the whole remains pure gold.—Origen. *in Exod. Homil.* vi. § 4. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 148. col. 2. B. Migne, ii. 334.] Orig. περὶ ἀρχῶν, lib. i. cap. 6. [§ 3. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 70. col. 2. D. Migne, i. 169.]—[Hoc sancta Scriptura non dicit: et evertit penitus timorem Dei, dum facile homines labuntur ad vitia: putantes etiam diabolum, qui auctor malorum est, et omnium peccatorum fons, acta pœnitentia posse salvari, de nostris mentibus abjiciatur . . . Alioquin si omnes rationabiles creaturæ æquales sunt; et vel ex virtutibus, vel ex vitiis sponte propria aut sursum eriguntur, aut in ima merguntur; et longo post circuitu atque infinitis sæculis, omnium rerum restitutio fiet, et una dignitas militantium, quæ distantia erit inter virginem et prostibulum? . . . Finge quod libet, annos et tempora duplica; et infinitas ætates congere cruciatibus: si finis omnium similis est, præteritum omne pro nihilo est: quia non quærimus quid aliquando fuerimus, sed quid semper futuri simus. This is not said by the Holy Scripture; and it entirely overturns the fear of God, since men easily slide into vice; thinking that even the devil, who is the author of evil and the spring of all sins, can be saved by performing penance: let us cast this out of our minds. In other respects, if all rational creatures are equal; and whether by virtues or by vices of their own accord are either raised up or plunged low; and in a long journey afterwards, and after infinite ages, there will be a restitution of all things, and one equal rank of those who contend, what will be the superiority of the virgin over the prostitute? . . . Imagine it how you please; double the years and the time; and arrange an infinite period for the torments; if the end of all is alike, all the past goes for nothing; because we do not ask what we shall have been at some time, but what we shall be for ever.]—S. Hieronym. *in Jonæ Proph.* cap. iii. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 1488.]—Porro non [defuerunt, qui adeo purgatorium probarint, ut nullas pœnas, nisi purgatorias, post hanc vitam agnoverint. Ita Origenes sensit, etc. Further, they were many who accepted the doctrine of purgatory in the sense that there would be no other punishments after this life, besides those of purgatory. So Origen thought.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgatorio*, lib. i. cap. 2. § 12. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 573. C.]—[Qua in re misericordior profecto fuit Origenes, qui et ipsum diabolum atque angelos ejus post graviora pro meritis et diuturniora supplicia ex illis cruciatibus eruendos atque sociandos sanctis angelis *credidit*. Sed illum, et propter hoc, et propter alia . . . non immerito reprobavit Ecclesia, etc. In this matter Origen was more merciful, for he believed that the devil himself and his angels after undergoing long punishments, and those heavy in proportion to their deserts, would be delivered from the torments, and would company with the holy angels. But he for this and other errors was rightly condemned by the Church.]—S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 17. [*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 637. B. Migne, vii. 731.]

[64] S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 17. [Migne, vii. 731, *ubi sup.*]

[65] [Væ mihi si opus meum arserit, et laboris hujus patiar detrimentum! Etsi salvos faciet Dominus servos suos, salvi erimus per fidem, sic tamen salvi quasi per ignem: et si non exurimur, tamen uremur. Quomodo tamen alii remaneant in igne, alii pertranseant, alio loco nos docet Scriptura divina. Nempe in mare rubrum demersus populus est Ægyptiorum, transivit autem populus Hebræorum: Moyses pertransivit, præcipitatus est Pharao; quoniam graviora eum peccata merserunt. Eo modo præcipitabuntur sacrilegi in lacum ignis ardentis, qui superba in Deum jactavere convicia. Sequamur ergo hic positi columnam ignis, etc. Woe is me if my work should be burnt and I suffer the loss of this toil. Though God will keep His servants safe, it is by faith we shall be safe, and that safety we shall

[CHAPTER XIV.]

"as it were by fire"; leaving it as doubtful what was meant by that "fire," as the place itself doth whence it is taken. St. Jerome, indeed, names a "purging by fire,"[66] but it is not very plain that he means it after this life. And, howsoever, this is most plain, that St. Jerome is at *credimus*, "we believe" eternal punishment; but he goes no farther than *arbitramur*, "we think" there is a purging. So with him it was arbitrary, and therefore, sure, no matter of faith then. And, again, he saith, "that some Christians may be saved, *post pœnas*, 'after some punishments endured,'" but he neither tells us where nor when.[67] St. Basil names, indeed, "purgatory-fire," but he relates as uncertainly to that in 1 Cor. iii. [15.] as St. Ambrose doth.[68] As for Paulinus, he speaks for prayer for the dead, but not a word of purgatory.[69] And the place in St. Gregory Nazianzen[70] is far from a manifest place; for he speaks

1 Cor. iii. 15.

gain as through fire; and if we are not consumed, still we shall bear the flame. In another place the Scripture teaches us how some remain in the fire, while others pass through it. In this way. The people of the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, while the people of the Hebrews passed through it; Moses passed through it; Pharaoh was hurled into it, since his heavy sins drowned him. In the same way, the wicked shall be hurled into the lake of burning fire, for boasting their proud insults against God. Let us therefore, while we are placed here, follow the column of fire.]—S. Ambros. [*Enarratio*] *in Psal.* xxxvi. 14. [§ 26. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 790. A.]

[66] [Et sicut diaboli et omnium negatorum atque impiorum, qui dixerunt in corde suo, Non est Deus, credimus æterna tormenta: sic peccatorum atque impiorum et tamen Christianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda sunt atque purganda, moderatam arbitramur et mixtam clementiæ sententiam Judicis. And just as we believe in the everlasting torments of the Devil and of all the atheists and impious men who have said in their heart, There is no God; so we think that the sinners and the impious, being still Christians after their works are proved and purged in fire, will have a sentence passed on them by the Judge, moderated and mingled with mercy.]—S. Hieronym. *in Isaiæ Proph.* cap. lxvi. in fine. [*Op.*, tom. iii. col. 515.]

[67] [Si autem Origenes omnes rationabiles creaturas dicit non esse perdendas, et diabolo tribuit pœnitentiam, quid ad nos, qui et diabolum et satellites ejus omnesque impios et prævaricatores dicimus perire perpetuo: et Christianos, si in peccato præventi fuerint, salvandos esse post pœnas?—But if Origen says that no rational creature will be lost, and ascribes penitence even to the devil, why should we trouble about his opinion, since we say that the devil and his satellites, and all impious men and transgressors will perish for ever; and that Christians, if they have been taken in sin must suffer punishment before they are saved?]—S. Hieronym. *Dialog. adversus Pelagianos*, lib. i. (ultra medium.) [*Op.*, tom. iv. par. 2. col. 502.]

[68] S. Basil. *in Esaiam Proph.* cap. ix. [§ 230. *Op.*, in App. ad tom. i. p. 553. E. et, § 231. *ibid.* p. 554. B. Migne, ii. 520. These Commentaries have been held doubtful by Petavius and others. The weight of evidence seems to decide that they are genuine.]

[69] S. Paulini, Epist. 1. [*ad Amandum*, id est, *Epist.* xxxvi. al. xx. § 2. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 224. ed. Paris. 1685.]

[70] [*τυχὸν ἐκεῖ τῷ πυρὶ βαπτισθήσονται, τῷ τελευταίῳ βαπτίσματι, τῷ ἐπιπονωτέρῳ τε καὶ μακροτέρῳ, ὃ ἐσθίει ὡς χόρτον τὴν ὕλην, καὶ δαπανᾷ πάσης κακίας κουφότητα.* Perhaps they will be baptised then with fire, the final baptism, the most painful

there of "baptism by fire," which is no usual phrase to signify purgatory.[71] But yet, say that here he doth, there is τυχὸν, a *fortassis*, a "peradventure" in the words, which Bellarmine cunningly leaves out. And if it be a "peradventure ye shall then be baptized with fire," why then it is at a "peradventure" too that ye shall not. Now such casual stuff as this—peradventure you shall, and peradventure you shall not—is no expression for things which are valued to be *de fide*, and to be believed as "matters of faith." Bellarmine goes on with Lactantius,[72] but with no better success. For he says, indeed, that some men *perstringentur igne*, "shall be sharply touched by fire"; but he speaks of such, *quorum peccata prævaluerint*, "whose sins have prevailed": and they, in Bellarmine's doctrine, are for hell, not purgatory. As for St. Hilary,[73] he will not come home neither. It is true he speaks of a fire too, and one that must be endured; but he tells us it is a punishment *expiandæ a peccatis animæ*, "to purge the soul from sins." Now this will not serve Bellarmine's turn. For they of Rome teach, That the sins are forgiven here, and that the temporal punishment only remains to be satisfied in purgatory: and what need is there then of purging of sins? Lest there should not be Fathers enough, he reckons in Boetius[74] too. But he, though not

and the most lengthy, which eats up the wood like straw, and consumes the vanity of all wickedness.]—S. Gregor. Nazianz. *Orat.* xxxix. [(*in sancta lumina,*) § 19.] in fine, [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 690. D.]

[71] I think the first that ever used that phrase, "baptism by fire," was Origen. And he used it for martyrdom, as clearly appears by a passage of his in Euseb. *Hist.* lib. vi. cap. 4. ed. Græc.-Lat. Coloniæ Allobrog. 1612. [The passage is: *καὶ γυναικῶν δὲ Ἡραΐς ἔτι κατηχουμένη, τὸ βάπτισμα, ὅν που φησὶν αὐτὸς, τὸ διὰ πυρὸς λαβοῦσα, τὸν βίον ἐξελήλυθεν·* Moreover, of the women, Herais was still a catechumen, and she received the baptism, as He Himself calls it somewhere, of fire, and passed through it into life.—Apud *Eccles. Histor. Scriptor.*, ed. Reading, tom. i. p. 262.]

[72] [Sed et justos cum judicaverit, etiam in igni eos examinabit. Tum quorum peccata vel pondere, vel numero, prævaluerint, perstringentur igni atque amburentur. But when He shall have judged the just, He will further examine them by fire. Then those whose sins shall be excessive either in weight or in number, shall be touched and scorched with fire.]—Lactant. [died c. 325, tutor to Crispus the son of Constantine.] [*Divin. Institut.*] lib. vii. cap. xxi. [de Cruciatibus et Pœnis Animarum, *Op.*, tom. i. p. 574. ed. Lebrun et Dufresnoy, Paris. 1748.]

[73] [Bishop of Poitiers, 350-367, opposed the Arians.]

[An cum ex omni otioso verbo rationem simus præstituri, diem judicii concupiscemus, in quo nobis est ille indefessus ignis subeundus, in quo subeunda sunt gravia illa expiandæ a peccatis animæ supplicia? Since we have got to give an account for every idle word, shall we desire the day of judgment, in which we must undergo that unquenchable fire, in which we must undergo the heavy punishments of a soul being cleansed from sins?]—S. Hilar. [*Tract.*] *in Ps.* cxviii. [Lit. iii.] vers. 20. [*Op.*, col. 261. A.]

[74] Boetius, [*de Consolatione Philosophiæ,*] lib. iv. Prosa 4. [*Op.*, p. 1079. ed. Basil. 1570.]

[CHAPTER XIV.]

long before a convert, yet was so well seen in this point, that he goes no farther than *puto*, "I think" that, after death, some souls are exercised *purgatoria clementia*, "with a purgative clemency." But *puto*, "I think" it is so, is no expression for "matter of faith." The two pregnant authorities which seem to come home, are those of St. Gregory Nyssen[75] and Theodoret.[76] But for Theodoret, *in Scholiis Græcis*,[77] which is the place Bellarmine quotes, I can find no such thing; and manifest it is, Bellarmine[78] himself took it but upon trust. And for St. Gregory Nyssen,[79] it is true, some places in him seem plain; but then they are made so doubtful by other places in him, that I dare not say simply and roundly what his judgment was. For he says, "Men must be purged from perturbations, and either by prayers and philosophy, or the study of wisdom, or by the furnace of purgatory-fire after this life." And again, "That a man cannot be partaker (θειότητος) of the Divine nature, unless the purging fire doth take away the stains that are in his soul." And again, "That after this life, a purgatory-fire takes

[75] [Bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, brother of St. Basil; lived 330-394 A.D.]

[76] [Bishop of Cyrrhus in Mesopotamia; lived 390 to 457 A.D.]

[77] [The passage quoted as from] Theodoret, in *1 Cor.* iii., [by Bellarmine, (*de Purgator.* cap. x. etc. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 608. C.) is: Hunc ipsum ignem purgatorium credimus, in quo animæ defunctorum probantur, et repurgantur, sicut aurum in conflatorio. We believe that this is the very purgatorial fire in which the souls of the dead are tested and purged again, like gold in a furnace.—But nothing like it is extant in the place referred to: *Op.*, tom. iii. p. 134. C. ed. Paris. 1642.]

[78] [Adducit etiam B. Thomas in opusculo primo contra Græcos, (sc. in fin. apud S. Thom. *Opusc.*, fol. 9. I. ed. Morelles, Antv. 1612.) Theodoretum explicantem hunc locum, (sc. *1 Cor.* iii. 15.) his verbis: Hunc credimus ignem purgatorium, quo purgantur animæ, ut aurum in conflatorio. The Blessed Thomas also in his first work against the Greeks brings forward Theodoret as explaining this passage (sc. *1 Cor.* iii. 15.) in these words, etc.; as above. —Gagneius vero eandem sententiam Theodoreti ex Græcorum Scholiis Græcis verbis ita citat: *τοῦτο τὸ πῦρ πιστευόμεν καθαρτήριον, ἐν ᾧ καθαρίζονται αἱ ψυχαί, καθάπερ χρυσίον ἐν τῷ χωνευτηρίῳ.* But Gagneius cites the same passage from the Greek comments in the Greek words. This fire we believe to be purgatorial, in which souls are purged, as gold in the melting furnace.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgator.* lib. i. cap. 5. § antepenult. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 591. B.]

[79] *διὰ προσευχῆς τε καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἐκκαθαρθεὶς, ἢ μετὰ τὴν [ἐνθένδε μετανάστασιν, διὰ τῆς τοῦ καθαρσίου πυρὸς χωνείας.* Cleansed both by prayer and by philosophy, or after the migration from hence by the furnace of purging fire.]—S. Gregor. Nyssen. *Orat. de Mortuis*, [*Op.*,] tom. ii. p. 1066. ed. Paris. 1615. [tom. iii. p. 634. D. ed. Paris. 1638.—Et infra: *ἐν τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι μετασχεῖν τῆς θειότητος, μὴ τοῦ καθαρσίου πυρὸς] τὸν ἐμμιχθέντα τῇ ψυχῇ ῥύπον [ἀποκαθήραντος.* Since he cannot be a partaker of the divine life, unless the purging fire has cleansed away the stains in his soul.]—[*Ibid.*] p. 1067. [p. 635. D.—Et infra: *τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν διὰ τῆς εἰς ὕστερον ἀγωγῆς] ἐν τῷ καθαρσίῳ πυρὶ ἀποβαλλόντων [τὴν πρὸς τὴν ὕλην προσπάθειαν·]* [And the rest by means of the training hereafter cast away in the purging fire the inclination to evil.]—*Ibid.* p. 1068. [p. 636. A.]

away the blots and propensity to evil." And, I deny not, divers other like places are in him. But first, this is quite another thing from the Roman purgatory. For St. Gregory tells us here, that the purgatory he means, purges "perturbations," and "stains," and "blots," and "propensity to evil": whereas the purgatory which Rome now teaches, purges not "sin, but is only satisfactory by way of punishment for sins already forgiven, but for which satisfaction was not made before their death."[80] Secondly, St. Gregory Nyssen himself seems not obscurely to relate to some other fire.[81] For he says expressly, "That the soul is to be punished, till the vitiosity of it be consumed *purgatorio igne*"—so the translation renders it; but in the original it is τῷ ἀκοιμήτῳ πυρὶ, that is, "in a fire that sleeps not," which, for aught appears, may be understood of a fire that is eternal: whereas the fire assigned to purgatory shall cease. Besides, St. Gregory says plainly, "the soul cannot suffer by fire but in the body;[82] and the body cannot be with it till the resurrection." Therefore he must needs speak of a fire after the resurrection, which must be either the fire of the general

[80] Item definimus, si vere pœnitentes in Dei caritate decesserint, antequam dignis pœnitentiæ fructibus de commissis satisfecerint et omissis, [eorum animas] pœnis purgatoriis post mortem purgari, [et ut a pœnis hujusmodi releventur, prodesse eis fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes et eleemosynas, et alia pietatis officia, quæ a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus fieri consueverunt, . . . Also we define, that if true penitents die in the love of God before they have paid the due fruits of penance for their sins of commission and of omission, their souls will be purged by the punishments of purgatory after death; and for their release from these punishments, the prayers of the living faithful will do good, that is to say the sacrifices of masses, petitions, and gifts of charity and other duties of piety which the faithful are accustomed to discharge for other faithful.]—Concil. Florentin. [in definit.] circa princip. per Binium, ed. Colon. 1618. [*Concil.* tom. xiii. col. 515. B.]

[81] [The word used by St. Gregory in the phrase Laud translates is αἰώνιος, not ἀκοίμητος. In no part of the passage is it "purgatorial." καὶ ὥσπερ τὴν ἐμμιχθεῖσαν τῷ χρυσίῳ ὕλην οἱ διὰ πυρὸς ἐκκαθαροῦντες, οὐ μόνον τὸ νόθον τῷ πυρὶ τήκουσιν. ἀλλὰ κατὰ πάσαν ἀνάγκην καὶ τὸ καθαρὸν τῷ κιβδήλῳ συγκατατήκεται, κἀκείνου δὲ δαπανωμένου τοῦτο μένει, οὕτω καὶ τῆς κακίας τῷ ἀκοιμήτῳ πυρὶ δαπανωμένης, ἀνάγκη πᾶσα καὶ τὴν ἐνωθεῖσαν αὐτῇ ψυχὴν ἐν τῷ πυρὶ εἶναι, ὡς ἂν τὸ κατεσπαρμένον νόθον καὶ ὑλώδες καὶ κίβδηλον ἀπαναλωθῇ τῷ αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ δαπανώμενον· And, as those who purge away with fire the wood mingled with the gold, not only melt the counterfeit coin with the fire, but of necessity the genuine is melted down with the base; but while the latter is destroyed, the former remains; so too when wickedness is being destroyed by the unquenchable fire (lit. that sleeps not), it is absolutely necessary that the soul which is contaminated by it should be in the fire, in order that the counterfeit and wooden and base coin which is scattered about in it should be destroyed and perish in the everlasting fire.]—S. Gregor. Nyssen. *de Anima et Resurrect.* [*Op.*,] tom. ii. p. 658, [tom. iii. p. 226. C.]

[82] [ψυχῆς δὲ καθ' ἑαυτὴν οὔποτ' ἂν ἅψαιτο πῦρ· κ.τ.λ. But the fire could in no way touch the soul by itself.]—S. Gregor. [Nyssen.] *in Christi Resurrection.* Orat. iii. [*Op.*, tom. iii. p. 434. A.]

[CHAPTER XIV.] conflagration, or hell: purgatory he cannot mean, where, according to the Romish tenet, the soul suffers without the body. The truth is, divers of the ancients, especially Greeks, which were a little too much acquainted with Plato's school,[83] philosophized and disputed upon this and some other points with much obscurity, and as little certainty. So, upon the whole matter, in the fourth and fifth hundred year, you see here is none that constantly and perspicuously affirm it. And as for St. Augustine, he said,[84] and unsaid[85]

[83] Non expedit philosophari altius, etc. [It is not convenient to philosophise too deeply.]—Orig. *cont. Celsum*, lib. vi. [The actual words are not to be found in Migne. The first twenty-one sections of the sixth book against Celsus are occupied by Origen in a discussion of the Platonic philosophy, together with a proof of its inferiority to Christian doctrine.]

[84] Constat animas purgari post hanc vitam. [It is clear that souls are purged after this life.]—S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 24. [§ 2. *Op.*, tom. vii. col. 641. F. This passage is thus cited by Bellarmine, *de Purgatorio*, lib. i. cap. 10. (*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 607. D.,) from whom Laud seems to have taken it: Tales, (sc. adultos levioribus peccatis maculatos) constat ante judicii diem per pœnas temporales, quas eorum spiritus patiuntur, purgatos, (receptis corporibus) æterni ignis suppliciis non tradendos. It is agreed that such persons (*i.e.* adults stained with the lighter sins), having been purged before the day of judgment by temporal punishments which their spirits suffer, having received their bodies, must not be delivered to the punishments of eternal fire. It occurs in the edition of Erasmus, but is abandoned by the Benedictine editors, on the ground that minime reperitur in aliis libris, neque cum antecedentibus et subsequentibus verbis satis cohæret. It is not often found in the other copies, nor does it agree properly with the words which go before and which follow. Migne also rejects it, vii. 737.]

[85] [Si igitur mortuo corpore] ad paradisum anima mox [vocatur . . . non initium mœroris mors ista, sed finis est:] nec incipiunt post hanc justorum flagella, sed desinunt. [If therefore, after the body is dead, the soul is soon called to Paradise, this death is not the beginning of sorrow, but the end; nor do the stripes inflicted upon the just begin after this, but they cease.]—[Pseudo-] S. Augustin. *contra Felicianum* [*Arianum, de unitate Trinitatis*,] cap. xv. [apud *Op.*, S. Augustin. tom. viii. in Appen. col. 48. C. This work is adjudged to be spurious.]—Et duo tantum loca esse, [ait] S. Augustinus. [And two places only are there, says St. Augustine.]—[Serm. clxxxviii. olim] Serm. xix. *de verbis Apostoli*, [tit. i.] cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. v. col. 850. B. The passage seems to be: Quibus autem (Deus) non est daturus regnum cœlorum, quid eis restat, nisi pœna gehennarum? For those to whom God does not intend to give the kingdom of heaven, what remains, but the punishment of hell?]—Et, [S. Augustin.] *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 16. in fin. negat, nisi sit ignis ille in consummatione sæculi. [St. Augustine denies it, unless this fire is to be at the end of the world.—His words are: Quisquis igitur cupit pœnas evadere sempiternas, non solum baptizetur, verum etiam justificetur in Christo, ac sic vere transeat a diabolo ad Christum. Purgatorias autem pœnas nullas futuras opinetur, nisi ante illud ultimum tremendumque judicium. Nequaquam tamen negandum est, etiam ipsum æternum ignem pro diversitate meritorum, quamvis malorum, aliis leviorem, aliis futurum esse graviorem, sive ipsius vis atque ardor pro pœna digna cujusque varietur, sive ipse æqualiter ardeat, sed non æquali molestia sentiatur. Whoever, therefore, desires to escape everlasting punishment, must not only be baptised but also justified in Christ, and so truly pass from the Devil to Christ. And he must think there will be no cleansing (purgatorial) punishments,

it, and at last left it doubtful;[86] which, had it then been received as a point of faith, he durst not have done. Indeed, then, in St. Gregory the Great's time, in the beginning of the sixth

except before that last and tremendous judgment. By no means, however, must we deny that that eternal fire will be less for some and more for others according to the difference of their merits (though evil); but we do not know whether its force and heat is varied for the punishment due to each, or itself burns equally, but is not felt with equal pain.—*Op.*, tom. vii. col. 636. F. Migne, vii. 731.]

[86] [Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri, incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit,] quæri potest: [et aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quemdam purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusque salvari; non tamen tales de quibus dictum est, quod Regnum Dei non possidebunt, nisi convenienter pœnitentibus eadem crimina remittantur. It is not incredible that some such thing should happen after this life; and whether it is so we may enquire; and it may be discovered or not whether some of the faithful by means of some purging fire, will be saved later or earlier according as they have loved the perishing property of this world less or more; but not those about whom it is said they will not gain the Kingdom of God; unless indeed they are properly penitent and their sins are forgiven.]—S. Augustin. *in Enchiridion* [*de Fide, Spe, et Caritate,*] cap. lxix. [*Op.*, tom. vi. col. 222. F.]—[Post istius sane corporis mortem, donec ad illum veniatur, qui post resurrectionem corporum futurus est damnationis et remunerationis ultimus dies, si hoc temporis intervallo spiritus defunctorum ejusmodi ignem dicuntur perpeti, quem non sentiant illi qui non habuerunt tales mores et amores in hujus corporis vita, ut eorum ligna, fœnum, stipula consumatur; alii vero sentiant qui ejusmodi secum ædificia portaverunt, sive ibi tantum, sive et hic et ibi, sive ideo hic ut non ibi, sæcularia, quamvis a damnatione venialia concremantem ignem transitoriæ tribulationis inveniant, non redarguo, quia] forsitan verum est. [Potest quippe ad istam tribulationem pertinere etiam ipsa mors carnis, quæ de peccati primi perpetratione concepta est, ut secundum cujusque ædificium tempus quod eam sequitur ab unoquoque sentiatur. On the death of the body, until the last day come, which after the resurrection of the body will be the day of condemnation and of reward, it is a matter of debate whether in this space of time that class of spirits of the dead endure a purging fire, which is not felt by those spirits who had no such character and no such affections in the life of this body: and whether they endure this in order that their wood, hay, and stubble may be consumed. The class I speak of as feeling the fire consists of those who have carried their worldly constructions with them either there only, or both here and there, or here and purposely not there, however much they find the fire of passing pain burning up these venial sins to keep them from damnation. I do not contradict this belief, perhaps it is a true one. Indeed the death of the flesh may even belong to this pain, for that death began with the commission of the first sin; and thus according to the construction made by each man are his experiences in the time which follows death.]—S. Augustin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 26. [§ 4. *Op.*, tom. vii. col. 649. A. Migne, vii. 745.]—Quid S. Paulus senserit *1 Cor.* iii. de igne illo, malo intelligentiores, et doctiores audire. [What St. Paul meant by that fire, *1 Cor.* iii., I prefer to hear the clever and the learned explain.]—S. Augustin. *lib. de Fide et Operibus*, cap. xvi. [§ 27. *Op.*, tom. vi. col. 180. B. His words are: Hic a me fortasse quæratur, de ipsa Pauli Apostoli sententia quid ego sentiam, et quonam modo intelligendam putem. Fateor, hinc mallem audire intelligentiores atque doctiores, qui sic eam exponant, ut illa omnia vera et inconcussa permaneant, quæ supra commemoravi, et quæcunque alia non commemoravi, quibus apertissime Scriptura testatur, nihil prodesse fidem, nisi eam quam definivit Apostolus, id est, quæ per dilectionem

age, purgatory was grown to some perfection. For St. Gregory[87] himself is at *scio*—(it was but at *puto* a little before)—"I know that some shall be expiated in purgatory flames." And therefore I will easily give Bellarmine all that follow; for, after this time, purgatory was found too warm a business to be suffered to cool again; and in the after-ages more were frighted, than led by proof, into the belief of it.

XVII. Now by this we see also, that it could not be a tradition; for then we might have traced it by the smoke to the Apostles' times. Indeed Bellarmine would have it such a tradition; for he tells us out of St. Augustine, "That that is rightly believed to be delivered by apostolical authority, which the whole Church holds, and hath ever held, and yet is not instituted by any council."[88] And he adds, "That Purgatory is such a tradition, so constantly held in the whole Church, Greek and Latin"; and "that we do not find any beginning of this belief."[89] Where I shall take the

operatur; sine operibus autem salvare non posse, neque præter ignem, neque per ignem: quia si per ignem salvat, ipsa utique salvat. Here perhaps I may be asked what my opinion is on that sentence in St. Paul the Apostle, and how I think it should be understood. I confess I should prefer to hear the clever and the learned who should explain it in such a way that all those points remain true and unshaken, which I have spoken about already, and also others about which I have not spoken, in which Scripture most plainly testifies that faith profits nothing except it be that which the Apostle defined, that is faith which worketh by love; and that without works faith cannot save, neither without fire nor with fire, because if it saves by fire, then it saves by itself.]

[87] [Domine ne in furore, etc. Quasi dicat: Scio futurum esse, ut post hujus vitæ exitum alii flammis expientur purgatoriis, alii sententiam æternæ subeant damnationis. Sed quia illum transitorium ignem omni tribulatione præsenti æstimo intolerabiliorem, non solum in furore æternæ damnationis opto non argui, sed etiam in ira traseuntis timeo correptionis purgari. Lord not in anger, etc.: as if he were to say, I know it will happen that after the end of this life some will be cleansed with purifying flames, others will endure a sentence of eternal damnation. But because I consider that temporary fire more unbearable than all trouble at the present time, not only do I wish not to be involved in the anger of eternal damnation; but I am even afraid to be purged in a passing seizure of wrath.]—S. Gregor. [Magn.] *in Psalm.* iii. pœnitentialem, in princip. [§ 1. *Op.*, tom. iii. par. 2. col. 481. E. Migne, v. 568.]

[88] Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur, etc. [That which the universal Church holds, though it has not been appointed by Councils, but has always been retained, is most rightly believed to have been handed down on the authority of the Apostles.]—S. Augustin. *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. iv. cap. 24. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 140. C.]—Nec ad summos pontifices referri potest, addit Melch. Canus. [Nor can this be referred to the supreme Pontiffs, adds Melchior Canus.]—*de Locis* [*Theolog.*] lib. iii. [de tradit. Apostol.] cap. 4. in princip.

[89] Non invenimus initium hujus dogmatis, sed omnes veteres Græci et Latini, etc. [We have not found the origin of this dogma, but all the old Greek and Latin writers, etc.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgat.* lib. i. cap. 15. § 14. [*vide supra*, p. 403. note 56.]

boldness to observe these three things: First, That the doctrine of Purgatory was not held ever in the whole Catholic Church of Christ; and this appears by the proofs of Bellarmine himself produced,[90] and I have before examined;[91] for there it is manifest, that scarce two Fathers directly affirm the belief of Purgatory for full six hundred years after Christ. Therefore Purgatory is no matter of faith, nor to be believed as descending from "apostolical authority," by St. Augustine's rule. Secondly, That we can find a "beginning" of this doctrine, and a beginner too—namely, Origen: and neither Bellarmine nor any other is able to show any one Father of the Church that said it before him; therefore Purgatory is not to be believed as a doctrine delivered by "apostolical authority," by Bellarmine's own rule, for it hath a "beginning." Thirdly, I observe, too, that Bellarmine cannot well tell where to lay the foundation of Purgatory, that it may be safe: for, first, he labours to found it upon Scripture. To that end he brings no fewer than ten places out of the Old Testament, and nine out of the New,[92] to prove it; and yet, fearing lest these places be strained, as indeed they are, and so too weak to be laid under such a vast pile of building as Purgatory is, he flies to unwritten tradition;[93] and by this "word of God unwritten," he says, "it is manifest that the doctrine of Purgatory was delivered by the Apostles." Sure, if nineteen places of Scripture cannot prove it, I would be loth to fly to tradition; and if recourse to tradition be necessary, then certainly those places of Scripture made not the proof they were brought for. And, once more, How can Bellarmine say here, that we find not the "beginning" *hujus dogmatis*, "of this article," when he had said before, that he had found it in nineteen places of Scripture? For if in these places he could not find the beginning of the doctrine of Purgatory, he is false while he says he did; and if he did find it there, then he is false here in saying we find no beginning of it. And for all his brags of "*omnes veteres*,[94] 'all the ancient' Greek and Latin do constantly teach Purgatory"; yet Alphonsus a Castro deals honestly and

[90] [Id.] *de Purgat.* lib. i. cap. 10. [*vide supra*, p. 403. note 57.]

[91] Sect. xxxviii. No. 16. [*vide supra*, p. 403.]

[92] Bellarmin. *de Purgator.* lib. i. capp. 3, 4. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 574—581.]

[93] De tertio modo perspicuum est, etc. [About the third method; it is clear.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgator.* lib. i. cap. 15. § 10. et § 14. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 625. B. C. *ubi supra*, p. 403. note 56.]

[94] Omnes veteres Græci et Latini, etc. [All the old Greek and Latin writers, etc.]—Bellarmin. *de Purgat.* lib. i. cap. 15. § 14. [*ubi supra*, p. 403. note 56.]

[CHAPTER XIV.] plainly, and tells us, "That the mention of Purgatory in ancient writers is *fere nulla*, 'almost none at all,' especially in the Greeks."[95] And he adds, "That hereupon Purgatory is not believed by the Grecians to this very day." And what now, I pray, after all this, may I not so much as "deliberately doubt" of this, because it is now defined, and but now in a manner, and thus? No, sure. So A. C. tells you. Doubt? No. For when you had fooled the Archbishop of Spalato back to Rome, there you either made him say, or said it for him,—for in print it is, and under his name,—"That since it is now defined by the Church, a man is as much bound to believe there is a Purgatory, as that there is a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead."[96] How far comes this short of blasphemy, to make the Trinity and Purgatory things alike, and equally credible?

A. C. p. 71. XVIII. Yea, but A. C. will give you a reason why no man may "deliberately doubt," much less deny, anything that is defined by a General Council: and his reason is, "because every such doubt and denial is a breach from the one saving faith." This is a very good reason, if it be true. But how appears it to be true? How? Why, "it takes away," saith A. C. "infallible credit from the Church; and so, the Divine revelation being not sufficiently applied, it cannot, according to the ordinary course of God's providence, breed infallible belief in us." Why, but "deliberately to doubt" and "constantly to deny," upon the grounds and in the

A. C. p. 71.

[95] De purgatorio in antiquis scriptoribus potissimum Græcis fere nulla mentio est. Qua de causa usque in hodiernum diem Purgatorium non est a Græcis creditum. [About purgatory in the writings of the ancient Greek fathers there is almost no mention, etc.]—Alphon. a Castro, *advers. Hæres.* lib. viii. *verb.* Indulgentiæ, [*ubi sup.* p. 395. note 38.]

[96] Purgatorium nullum esse, . . . [hi et similes errores, ac] manifestæ hæreses . . . [scopuli sunt miserabiles, etc. That there is no such place as Purgatory . . . These and like errors and evident heresies, . . . are unfortunate reefs, etc.]—M. Anton. de Dominis, *sui reditus ex Anglia consilium exponit*, ed. Paris. 1623. p. 17. [De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato, was in England from 1616 to 1622, and professed himself a member of the English Church. He went back to Italy, and died in a Roman prison in 1624. See Fuller, *Church History*, Book x. Sec. vi. Fuller gives him a very bad character.]—Merita, Indulgentiæ, et reliqua, quæ superius ut in ecclesia definita commemoravi, sunt omnes articuli fundamentales, quia non minus nituntur revelationi, quam priora de Trinitate.—[Merits (of the Saints), Indulgences and the rest which I have mentioned as defined in the Church are all fundamental articles, because they rest on revelation just as plainly as the former ones about the Trinity.]—*Ibid.* p. 32.—And so much A. C. himself says of all points in which, in the doctrine of the faith, Protestants differ from them.—In his *Relation of the first Conference*, p. 28. [The passage to which Laud probably alludes is: "Mr. Fisher replied, saying, first, that if time permitted, he could prove all points of divine faith to be fundamental, supposing they were points generally held, or defined by full authority of the Church," p. 18.]

manner aforesaid,[97] doth not take away "infallible credit" from the whole Church, but only from the definition of a General Council, some way or other misled; and that in things not absolutely necessary to all men's salvation, for of such things A. C. here speaks expressly.[98] Now, to take away "infallible credit" from some definitions of General Councils, in things not absolutely necessary to salvation, is no breach upon the "one saving faith" which is necessary, nor upon the credit of the Catholic Church of Christ in things absolutely necessary, for which only it had infallible assistance promised; so that no breach being made upon the faith, nor no credit, which ever it had, being taken from the Church, the Divine revelation may be, and is, as sufficiently applied as ever it was; and, in the ordinary course of God's providence, may breed as infallible belief in things necessary to salvation as ever it did.

A. C. p. 71. Rom. x. 14, 15.

XIX. But A. C. will prove his reason before given, and therefore he asks us out of St. Paul, "'How shall men believe unless they hear? how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach' to wit, infallibly, 'unless they be sent,'—that is, from God, and infallibly assisted by His Spirit?" Here is that which I have twice, at least, spoken to already; namely, That A. C. by this will make every priest in the Church of Rome that hath learning enough to preach, and dissents not from that Church, an infallible preacher; which no Father of the Primitive Church did ever assume to himself, nor the Church give him. And yet the Fathers of the Primitive Church were sent, and from God; were assisted, and by God; and did sufficiently propose to men the divine revelation, and did by it beget and breed up faith, saving faith, in the souls of men; though no one among them since the Apostles was an infallible preacher.[99] And A. C. should

[97] Sect. xxxviii. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 385.]

[98] "Though everything defined to be a divine truth in General Councils is not absolutely necessary to be expressly known, and actually believed by all sorts," etc.—A. C. p. 71.

[99] Alios autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem, quod ipsi ita senserunt, vel scripserunt. [But others I read with this feeling, that however great their sanctity and power of teaching—still I do not simply think a matter true because it was their opinion and written by them.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.* par. 1. Q[uæst.] i. A[rtic.] 8. [Respons.] ad 2. ex S. Augustin. *Epist.* [lxxxii. *ad Hieronym.* olim] xix. [apud *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 109. F.—Migne, i. 467.]—Mihi non credas, nisi demonstrationem accipias ex sacris literis. [Do not believe me unless you obtain proof from the Holy Books.] —[*δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων, μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν· καὶ μὴ ἁπλῶς πιθανότησι καὶ λόγων κατασκευαῖς παραφέρεσθαι· μηδὲ ἐμοὶ*

CHAPTER XIV.] C. p. 70.

have done very well here to have made it manifest, that this Scripture, "'How shall they preach?' (to wit, infallibly,)" is so interpreted by "unanime consent of fathers, and definitions of Councils," as he bragged before, that they use to interpret Scripture; for I do not find "'How shall they preach?' (to wit, infallibly,)"[100] to be the comment of any one of the Fathers, or any other approved author: and let him show it if he can.

τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι, ἁπλῶς πιστεύσῃς· ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θείων μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν. For it is necessary in the case of divine and holy mysteries of faith, that a mere chance statement should not be delivered without support from the Holy Scriptures; and that it should not simply be handed on with persuasive arguments and with ordered words. And do not simply believe me when I say these things to you, unless you obtain the proof of what I preach from the Holy Scriptures.]—S. Cyril. Hierosolym. *Cateches.* iv. [cap. 17. col. 60. A. ed. Benedict.—Migne, 476.]

[100] Verba hæc Apostoli non possunt intelligi de fide infusa, illa enim immediate a Deo creata est, et non ex auditu ut hæc. Apertissime colligitur ex [Gabr.] Biel. in III. *Sentent.* [These words of the Apostle cannot be understood of infused faith, for that is created directly by God, and not like this by hearing. This opinion is most distinctly gathered from the statements of Biel.]—D[istinct.] xxv. Q[uæst.] 2. A[rtic.] 2. Conclus. 1. [1.]—Ergo fides acquisita necessaria est. [Therefore acquired faith is needed.]—*Ibid.* Sed præter [fidem] *acquisitam*, quod requiratur *fides infusa*, non solum propter intentionem actus, sed etiam propter assensum, et certitudinem, [patet,] quia [hoc] non potest esse a fide acquisita, scilicet firmus assensus: quia fide acquisita nullus credit alicui, nisi quem scit posse falli, et fallere, licet credat ipsum non velle fallere. [But besides acquired faith it is evident that infused faith is required, not only on account of the intention of the act, but also on account of the assent and certainty; because this cannot come from acquired faith,—I mean a firm assent cannot — since by acquired faith no one believes any one, except one who he knows may be deceived and even deceive, though he does not believe he will willingly deceive.]—[Duns] Scotus in III. *Sentent.* D[istinct.] xxiii. Q[uæst.] unic. [Schol. 15. *Op.*, tom. vii. p. 469.] Therefore, in the judgment of your own School, your preachers can both deceive and be deceived; and therefore certainly are not infallible. And M[elchior] Canus very expressly makes this but an introduction to infallible faith: Primum ergo id statuo, juxta communem legem aliqua exteriora et humana incitamenta necessaria esse quibus ad evangelii fidem inducamur. Quomodo enim credent ei, quem non audierunt? [First, therefore, I decide that in accordance with the general law some outside and human inducements are required, by which we may be led to the faith of the Gospel. For how shall they believe him whom they have not heard?]—[Melch.] Canus, *de Locis Theologicis*, lib. iv. cap. 8. § 6. [p. 51.]—Et iterum: Si *fides infusa* ita *fidei acquisitæ* niteretur, tanquam suo fundamento; ipsum fundamentum fidei nostræ non esset *divina* sed *humana veritas*. [And again if infused faith is so supported on acquired faith, as on its proper foundation, the actual foundation of our faith would not be divine but human truth.]—*Ibid.* § 8. [p. 54. His words are: Eorum hic errorem dissimulare non possum, qui asserunt, fidem nostram eo, tanquam in ultimam credendi causam, reducendam esse, ut credamus ecclesiam esse veracem: cui prius, inquiunt, assentimur per fidem acquisitam quam per infusam. Quod si verum esset, prima ratio formalis infusæ fidei, non esset veritas increata, sed creata. Quare fides nostra non inniteretur tanquam suo fundamento divinæ veritati, sed humanæ. Deinde cum assensus conclusionis non sit certior principiorum assensu . . . si fides infusa fidei acquisitæ niteretur,

XX. After this—for I see the good man is troubled, and forward and backward he goes—he falls immediately upon this question: "If a whole General Council defining what is divine truth, be not believed to be sent and assisted by God's Spirit, and consequently of infallible credit, what man in the world can be said to be of infallible credit?" Well, first, A. C. hath very ill luck in fitting his conclusion to his premises, and his consequent to his antecedent; and so it is here with him. For a General Council may be assisted by God's Spirit, and in a great measure too, and in a greater than any private man not inspired, and yet not "consequently be of infallible credit," for all assistance of God's Spirit reaches not up to infallibility. I hope the ancient Bishops and Fathers of the Primitive Church were assisted by God's Spirit, and in a plentiful measure, too; and yet A. C. himself will not say they were infallible. And, secondly, for the question itself: "If a General Council be not, what man in the world can be said to be, of infallible credit?" Truly, I will make you a ready answer: No man. Not the pope himself? No. "Let God and His word be true, and every man a liar;" for so more or less, every man will be found to be: and this is neither damage to the Church, nor wrong to the person of any.

SECTION XXXVIII.

A. C. p. 71.

Rom. iii. 4.

XXI. But then A. C. asks a shrewder question than this: "If such a Council, lawfully called, continued, and confirmed, may err in defining any one divine truth, how can we be infallibly certain of any other truth defined by it? For if it may err in one, why not in another, and another, and so in all?"[101] It is most true, if such a Council may err in one, it may in another, and another,

A. C. p. 71.

tunc Deum esse trinum, cui assentimur per infusam fidem, non esset, nobis, aut firmius, aut certius, quam ecclesiam esse veracem: cui juxta horum sensum assentimur per fidem acquisitam, et per humanarum causarum incitamenta. Here I cannot pass over the mistake made by the teachers who assert that our faith must be reduced to this, as an ultimate reason for belief, that we believe the Church to be truthful; and they say we assent to the Church by acquired faith, before we assent by infused faith. But if this is true the first formal reason of infused faith would not be uncreated truth, but created truth (*i.e.* it would be not the truth of the Creator but of the Creature). And thus our faith would not rest, as on its foundation, upon divine truth, but upon human truth. Then, since the assent to a conclusion is not more sure than the assent to its premises, . . . if infused faith rests on acquired faith, then, that God is in Three Persons, to which we assent by infused faith, would be neither more sure nor more stable to us than that the Church is truthful, and to this we assent by acquired faith according to their opinion; and also by the inducements of human reasons.]—Therefore surely A. C. abuses this place of the Apostle very boldly.

[101] Sect. x. No. 15. [*vide supra*, p. 45.]

[CHAPTER XIV.] and so in all of like nature. I say, in all of like nature: and A. C. may remember he expressed himself a little before, to speak

A. C. p. 71. of "the defining of such divine truths as are not absolutely necessary to be expressly known and actually believed of all sorts of men." Now there is, there can be, no necessity of an "infallible certainty" in the whole Catholic Church, and much less in a General Council, of things "not absolutely necessary" in themselves.[102] For Christ did not intend to leave an "infallible certainty" in His Church to satisfy either contentious, or curious, or presumptuous spirits; and therefore, in things not fundamental, not necessary, it is no matter if Councils err in one, and another, and a third, the "whole Church" having power and means enough to see that no Council err in necessary things: and this is certainty enough for the Church to have, or for Christians to expect; especially since the foundation is so strongly and so plainly laid down in Scripture and the Creed, that a modest man might justly wonder why any man should run to any later Council, at least for any "infallible certainty."

A. C. p. 72. XXII. Yet A. C. hath more questions to ask; and his next is, "How we can, according to the ordinary course, be infallibly assured that it errs in one, and not in another, when it equally, by one and the same authority, defines both to be divine truth?" A. C., taking here upon him to defend Mr. Fisher the Jesuit, could not but see what I had formerly written concerning this difficult question about General Councils; and to all that, being large, he replied little or nothing. Now, when he thinks that may be forgotten, or as if it did not at all lie in his way, he here turns questionist, to disturb that business, and indeed the Church, as much as he can. But to this question also I answer again, If any General Council do now err, either it errs in things absolutely necessary to salvation, or in things not necessary. If it err in things necessary, we can be infallibly assured by the Scripture, the Creeds, the four first Councils, and the whole Church, where it errs in one and not in another. If it be *in non necessariis*, "in things not necessary," it is not requisite that we should have for them an infallible assurance. As for that which follows, it is notoriously both cunning and false. It is false, to suppose that a General Council defining two things for divine truths, and erring in one but not erring in another, doth define both equally "by one and the same authority": and it is cunning, because these words,

[102] Sect. xxv. No. 5. [*vide supra*, pp. 189, 190.]

"by the same authority," are equivocal, and must be distinguished, that the truth, which A. C. would hide, may appear. Thus, then, suppose a General Council erring in one point, and not in another; it doth define both, and equally by the same delegated authority which that Council hath received from the Catholic Church. But it doth not define both, and much less equally, "by the same authority of the Scripture," which must be the Council's rule as well as private men's; no, nor by the same authority of the whole Catholic Church, who did not intentionally give them equal power to define truth, and error for truth. And I hope A. C. dares not say the Scripture (according to which all Councils that will uphold divine truth must determine) doth equally give either ground or power to define error and truth.

SECTION XXXVIII.

XXIII. To his former questions A. C. adds, "That if we leave this to be examined by any private man, this examination, not being infallible, had need to be examined by another, and this by another, without end, or ever coming to infallible certainty necessarily required in that one faith which is necessary to salvation, and to that peace and unity which ought to be in the Church." Will this inculcating the same thing never be left? I told the Jesuit before,[103] that I give no way to any private man to be judge of a General Council; and there also I showed the way how an erring Council might be rectified, and the peace of the Church either preserved or restored, without lifting any private spirit above a Council, and without this process *in infinitum*, which A. C. so much urges, and which is so much declined in all sciences.[104] For as the understanding of a man must always have somewhat to rest upon, so must his faith; but a "private man,"[105] first for his own satisfaction, and after for the Church's, if he have just cause, may consider of and examine, by the "judgment of discretion"[106]

A. C. p. 72.

[103] Sect. xxxii. No. 5; Sect. xxxiii. Consid. vii. No. 4. [*vide supra*, p. 262 et p. 298.]

[104] Aristot. [*Analyt.*] *Post.* lib. i. [cap. 19. § 4. et seqq. et cap. 20. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 209. ed. Bekker.]—Et,—Aristot. *Metaphys.* lib. ii. [cap. 4. § 1. *Op.*, tom. viii. p. 48. ed. Bekker.]

[105] Sect. xxxviii. No. 15. [*vide supra*, p. 401.]

[106] [Investigandum est, an ad papam, vel ad ecclesiam, seu concilium, eam repræsentans, ultima eorum quæ sunt de fide decisio ac determinatio spectet.] Hic [enim] non loquimur de decisione, seu determinatione doctrinali, quæ ad unumquemque virum peritum spectare dignoscitur; sed de authoritativa et judiciali, etc. [We must investigate whether the ultimate decision and determination of matters of faith depends on the Pope, or on the Church, or on a Council representing the Church. For here we are not speaking of a doctrinal decision or determination, which we discern depends on some skilled man, but about an authoritative and judicial decision.]

[CHAPTER XIV.]

though not of power, even the definitions of a General Council. But A. C. concludes well, "that an infallible certainty is necessary for that one faith which is necessary to salvation": and of that, as I expressed before,[107] a most "infallible certainty" we have already in the Scripture, the Creeds, and the four first General Councils, to which, for things "necessary and fundamental in the faith," we need no assistance from other General Councils. And some of your own,[108] very honest and very learned, were of the same opinion with me. And for the "peace and unity of the Church in things absolutely necessary," we have the same infallible direction that we have for "faith": but in "things not necessary," though they be divine truths also, if about them Christian men do differ, it is no more than they have done, more or less, in all ages of the Church; and they may differ, and yet preserve the "one necessary faith,"[109] and charity,[110] too, entire, if

—Jac. Almain. *libell. de Authoritate Ecclesiæ*, etc., cap. x. in princip. [apud *Opuscula Aurea* Jac. Almain. fol. lvi. ed. Paris. 1517. Et apud Gersoni *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 1001. ed. Dupin.]

[107] Sect. xxxviii. No. 1. [*vide supra*, p. 379.]

[108] Sunt [tamen] qui nescio qua ducti ratione, [contrarium] sentiant, [dicentes,] non esse opus Generali Concilio (de Constantiensi loquitur) dicentes, omnia bene a patribus nostris ordinata ac constituta, modo ab omnibus legitime ac fideliter servarentur. Fatemur equidem id ipsum esse verissimum. Attamen cum eorum [ferme] omnium servetur nihil, etc. [Some, however, I do not know why, give a contrary opinion, saying that there is no need of a General Council (he is speaking about the Council of Constance), saying that all things have been well arranged and settled by our fathers, and need only to be kept by all legally and faithfully. We agree that this is most true. Still, when almost nothing is kept of their arrangements, etc.]—Pet. de Alliaco, [Card. Cameracensis,] *libell. de Reformatione Ecclesiæ*, [*oblat. in Concil. Constant.*] in fin. [These words are not those of the Cardinal himself, but are to be found in an editorial conclusion ad Lectorem (to the Reader), appended to an edition of the above tract, by the editor Orthuinus Gratius, apud *Fascicul. Rerum Expetendarum*, etc. fol. ccviii. *r.*—Cf. p. 149. note 10.]—So that after-Councils are rather to decree for observance, than to make any new determinations of the faith.

[109] Non omnis [autem] error, in his quæ fidei sunt, est peccatum] infidelitatis vel hæresis. [Not every error, among those which are of faith, is a sin of infidelity or heresy.]—Holkot, in I. *Sentent.* Q[uæst.] i. [Respons.] ad 4. K. [*ubi sup.* p. 389. note 19.]

[110] [Cæterum] scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria quæ apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere. Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, etc. [But we know that some men will never give up what they have once taken in, and do not easily change their purpose, but, held by the chain of peace and concord which connects colleagues, retain certain special practices which were once usual among them. In such a matter we neither put violence on any, nor lay down the law.]—S. Cyprian. [*Epist.* lxxii. *ad Stephanum de Concilio*,] olim lib. ii. Epist. 1. [in fine. *Op.*, p. 129.]—Concordia, quæ est caritatis effectus, est unio voluntatum, non [unio] opinionum. [The concord, which is the result of love, is a union of wills, not of opinions.]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] xxxvii. A[rtic.] 1. in

they be so well minded. I confess it were heartily to be wished, that in these things also men might be "all of one mind and one judgment," to which the Apostle exhorts. But this cannot be hoped for till the Church be triumphant over all human frailties, which here hang thick and close about her; the want both of "unity and peace" proceeding too often, even where religion is pretended, from men and their humours, rather than from things, and errors to be found in them.

SECTION XXXVIII.

1 Cor. i. 10. Phil. ii. 2.

XXIV. And so A. C. tells me, "That it is not, therefore," as I would persuade, "the fault of Councils' definitions, but the pride of such as will prefer, and not submit their private judgments, that lost, and continues the loss of, peace and unity of the Church, and the want of certainty in that one aforesaid soul-saving faith." Once again I am bold to tell A. C. that there is no want of certainty, most infallible certainty, of "that one soul-saving faith." And if for other opinions, which flutter about it, there be a difference, a dangerous difference, as at this day there is, yet necessary it is not that therefore, or for prevention thereof, there should be such a "certainty," an "infallible certainty," in these things. For he understood himself well, that said *Oportet esse hæreses;* "There must, there will be heresies." And wheresoever that necessity lies, it is, out of doubt, enough to prove that Christ never left such an infallible assurance as is able to prevent them, or such a mastering power in His Church as is able to overawe them; but they come with their *oportet* about them, and they rise and spring in all ages very strangely. But, in particular, for that which first caused, and now continues the loss of, unity in the Church of Christ, as I make no doubt but that the pride of men is one cause, so yet can I not think that pride is the adequate and sole cause thereof. But in part pride caused it, and pride on all sides: pride in some that would not at first, nor will not since, submit their private judgments, where with good conscience they may and ought; and pride in others, that would not first, nor will not yet, mend manifest, great, and dangerous errors, which with all good conscience they ought to do. But it is not pride, not to

A. C. p. 72.

1 Cor. xi. 19.

conclus. [Migne, iii. 320.]—Dissensio de minimis et de opinionibus, repugnat quidem paci perfectæ, in qua plene veritas cognoscetur, et omnis appetitus complebitur: non tamen repugnat paci imperfectæ, qualis habetur in via. —[Disagreement about small things and about opinions does indeed hinder perfect peace, in which truth is to be absolutely known, and every desire is to be gratified; but it does not hinder an imperfect peace, such as is enjoyed in "the way."]—S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] xxix. A[rtic.] 3. [Respons.] ad 2. [Migne, iii. 258.]

[Chapter XIV.] submit to known and gross errors; and the definitions of some Councils—perhaps the Lateran, Constance, and Trent,—have been greater and more urgent causes of breach of unity than the pride of men hath been, which yet I shall never excuse, wherever it is.

XXV. How far this "one soul-saving faith" extends, A. C. tells me I have confessed it "not a work for my pen"; "but," he says, A. C. p. 72. "it is to be learned from that one, holy, Catholic, Apostolic, always visible, and infallible Roman Church, of which the Lady, once doubting, is now fully satisfied," etc. Indeed, though A. C. sets this down with some scorn, which I can easily pass over, it is true that thus I said: "There is a latitude in faith, especially in reference to different men's salvation; but to set a bound to this, and strictly to define it—Just thus far you must believe in every particular, or incur damnation—is no work for my pen."[111] Thus I said, and thus I say still; for though the foundation be one and the same in all, yet a "latitude" there is, and a large one too, when you come to consider, not the foundation common to all, but things necessary to many particular men's salvation.[112] Luke xii. 48. For "to whomsoever God hath given more, of him shall more be required," as well in belief as in obedience and performance.[113] And the gifts of God, both ordinary and extraordinary, to particular men are so various, as that for my part I hold it

[111] Sect. xxxviii. No. 1. [*vide supra*, p. 379.]

[112] Sect. xxxviii. No. 8. [*vide supra*, p. 389.]

[113] Unicuique secundum proportionem suam, secundum differentiam scientiæ et ignorantiæ, etc.—Et postea: Extenditur doctrina hæc, non solum ad donum scientiæ, [sed ad quodcunque donum. To every one, in his proper proportion, according to the difference of his knowledge or his ignorance, etc. And afterwards, this doctrine is extended not only to the gift of knowledge, but to everything else.]—Cajetan. in *S. Luc.* cap. xii. [48. a Thom. de Vio, Card. Caietan. *Comment.* etc. tom. iv. pp. 231, 232.] —Ecce quod scientia aggravat culpam. Unde Gregorius: [Ubi donum majoris scientiæ, ibi transgressor majori subjacet culpæ. Note that knowledge aggravates the blame. Wherefore Gregory says, Where there is a gift of greater knowledge, there the offender receives greater blame.]—[Nicolai] Gorrani, [Ordin. Dominic.] in *S. Luc.* cap. xii. [48. In *IV. Evangel. Comment.* p. 673. col. 2. ed. Antverp. 1617.] Therefore many things may be necessary for a knowing man's salvation, which are not so for a poor ignorant soul. Si quis de antecessoribus nostris vel ignoranter, vel simpliciter non hoc observavit, et tenuit, quod nos Dominus facere exemplo et magisterio Suo docuit, potest simplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi. Nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc a Domino admoniti et instructi sumus, etc. [If any one of our predecessors, either from ignorance or from simplicity, shall have failed to observe this, and shall have held that the Lord taught us to do it by His example and instruction, pardon can be given to his simplicity by the Lord's indulgence. But we cannot be ignorant, there is no excuse for us to be ignorant, who have been admonished and taught by the Lord.] —S. Cyprian. [*Epist.* lxii. *ad Cæcilium*, olim] lib. ii. Epist. 3. [*Op.*, p. 109.]

impossible for the ablest pen that is to express it. And in this respect I said it with humility and reason, That to set these bounds was no work for my pen.[114] Nor will I ever take upon me to express that tenet or opinion, the denial of the foundation only excepted, which may shut any Christian, the meanest, out of heaven. And, A. C., I believe you know very well to what a narrow scantling some learned of your own side bring the very foundation itself, rather than they will lose any that lay hold on Christ, the Son of God, and Redeemer of the world.[115] And as Christ epitomizes the whole law of obedience into these two great commandments—the love of God and our neighbour; so the Apostle epitomizes the whole law of belief into these two great assents: "That God is; and that He is a rewarder of them that seek Him";—that seek Him in Christ. And St. Peter was full of the Holy Ghost when he expressed it, that "there is no salvation to them that seek it in or by another name."

SECTION XXXVIII.

Matt. xxii. 37.

Heb. xi. 6.

Acts iv. 12.

XXVI. But since this is no work for my pen, it seems A. C. will not say it is a work for his.[116] But he tells us, "It is to be learned of the one, holy, Catholic, Apostolic, always visible and infallible, Roman Church." Titles enough given to the Roman Church; and I wish she deserved them all, for then we should have peace. But it is far otherwise. "One" she is as a particular

A. C. p. 72.

[114] Sect. xxxviii. No. 1. [*vide supra*, p. 379.]

[115] Articuli fidei, sicut principia per se nota. Et similiter omnes articuli implicite continentur in aliquibus primis credibilibus, [scilicet ut credatur Deus esse et providentiam habere circa hominum salutem:] secundum illud ad *Hebr.* xi. [Accedentem ad Deum, etc. In esse enim Divino includuntur omnia, quæ credimus in Deo æternaliter existere, etc. In the doctrine of faith, there are articles of faith, just like definite first principles. And in like manner all the articles are implicitly contained in some of the first things we had to believe, for instance that God may be believed to exist, and to have a foresight concerning the salvation of man, according to the text in *Hebrews* xi. 6, "He that cometh to God, etc." For in the Divine Being all things are included which we believe exist in God from all eternity.] —S. Thom. [Aquin. *Summ.*] Secund. Secund. Q[uæst.] 1. A[rtic.] 7. in conclus. [Migne, iii. 19.]—In absoluto nobis ac facili est æternitas: Jesum et suscitatum a mortuis per Deum credere, et Ipsum esse Dominum confiteri. [Nemo itaque ea, quæ ob ignorationem nostram dicta sunt, ad occasionem irreligiositatis usurpet.] [Eternity is for us an absolute and easy belief, and to believe that Jesus was raised by God from the dead, and to confess that He is Lord. And so no man must use the things, which have been spoken because of our ignorance, for an occasion of irreligion.]—S. Hilar. *de Trinitate*, lib. x. [§ 70.] in fin. [*Op.*, col. 1080. E. Migne, ii. 397.]

[116] And yet before in this Conference, et apud A. C. p. 42, the Jesuit, whom he defends, hath said it expressly, "That all those points are fundamental which are necessary to salvation."

[CHAPTER XIV.]

Church, but not "the one." "Holy" she would be counted; but the world may see, if it will not blind itself, of what value holiness is in that court and country. "Catholic" she is not, in any sense of the word, for she is not the universal,[117] and so not catholic in extent. Nor is she sound in doctrine, and in things which come near upon the foundation too; so not catholic in belief.[118] Nor is she the "prime mother Church" of Christianity; Jerusalem was that:[119] and so not catholic as a fountain or original, or as the head or root of the catholic.

XXVII. And because many Romanists object here, though A. C. doth it not, that St. Cyprian called the Roman Church,

[117] Romana ecclesia particularis. [The particular Roman Church.]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. cap. 4. § 1. [in tit. *Op.*, tom. i. col. 811. D.]—Catholica autem est illa quæ diffusa est per universum orbem. [καθολικὴ μὲν οὖν καλεῖται, διὰ τοῦτο, κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων.—It is called Catholic for this reason that it is in all the world, from one end of the earth to the other.]—S. Cyril. Hierosolym. *Cateches.* xviii. [cap. 23. *Op.*, p. 296. A. Migne, 1044.]

[118] Catholica enim dicitur Ecclesia illa quæ universaliter docet sine ullo defectu, vel differentia dogmatum. [καθολικὴ μὲν οὖν καλεῖται . . . καὶ διὰ τὸ, διδάσκειν καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνελλειπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα, περὶ τε ὁρατῶν, κ.τ.λ. It is called Catholic, . . . and for this reason to teach everywhere and without ceasing all the dogmas which ought to come to the knowledge of men, both about the things seen and the things unseen, etc.]—S. Cyril. Hierosolym. *Cateches.* xviii. [cap. 23. *Op.*, p. 296. B. Migne, 1044.]—Unde Augustinus subscripsit se Episcopum ecclesiæ catholicæ Hipponeregiensis. [Wherefore Augustine subscribed himself Bishop of the Catholic Church in the diocese of Hippo.]—*De Actis cum Felice Manichæo*, lib. i. cap. 20. [*Op.*, tom. viii. col. 486. C.]—Et, [*ibid.*] lib. ii. cap. 1. [col. 485. D.]—Et, Catholica Alexandrinorum. [Κωνσταντῖνος Σεβαστὸς, τῇ καθολικῇ Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίᾳ· χαίρετε, κ.τ.λ. Constantine Augustus to the Catholic Church of the Alexandrians, hail, etc.]—Socratis *Histor. Ecclesiast.* lib. i. cap. 9. [apud *Eccles. Histor. Scriptor.* ed. Reading. tom. ii. p. 30.]—Et, [. . . τῷ λαῷ τῆς καθολικῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας. To the people of the Catholic Church of the Alexandrians.—*Ibid.*] lib. ii. cap. 3. [p. 81.] And so every particular Church is or may be called Catholic, and that truly, so long as it teaches Catholic doctrine. In which sense the particular Roman Church was called Catholic, so long as it taught all and only those things to be *de fide*, which the Catholic Church itself maintained. But now Rome doth not so.

[119] [*Vide*] *supra*, Sect. xxxv. No. 9. [p. 365.] Other Churches beside the Roman are called *matres* and *originales Ecclesiæ* [Mother and Original Churches.] as in Tertullian. *de præscript. Hæreticorum*, cap. xxi. [*Op.*, p. 209. Migne, ii. 33.]—Et, Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ, quæ aliarum omnium mater, etc. τῆς δέ γε μητρὸς [ἁπασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, κ.τ.λ.—The Church at Jerusalem, the Mother of all the other Churches.]—Theodoret. *Ecclesiast. Hist.* lib. v. cap. 9. ex libello Synodico a Concil. Constantinop. II. transmisso ad Concilium sub Damaso tum Romæ coactum, [apud *Eccles. Histor. Scriptor.* ed. Reading. tom. iii. p. 207.]—Et, *Constantinopolitana* Ecclesia dicitur omnium aliarum caput. *Cod.* [*Justinian.*] lib. i. tit. 2. [de sacrosanctis Ecclesiis,] leg. 24. [ἡ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐκκλησία πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶ κεφαλή. The Church at Constantinople is the head of all the others.]—That is, not simply of all Churches, but of all in that patriarchate. And so Rome is the head of all in the Roman patriarchate.

"the root and matrix of the Catholic Church of Christ,"[120] I hope I shall have leave to explain that difficult place also. First, then, St. Cyprian names not Rome. That stands only in the margin, and was placed there as his particular judgment led "him that set out St. Cyprian."[121] Secondly, the true story of that epistle, and that which led St. Cyprian into this expression, was this: Cornelius, then chosen pope, expostulates with St. Cyprian, that his letters to Rome were directed only to the clergy there, and not to him; and takes it ill, as if St. Cyprian had thereby seemed to disapprove his election. St. Cyprian replies, That by reason of the schism moved then by Novatian, it was uncertain, in Africa, which of the two had the more "canonical right to the see of Rome"; and that therefore he named him not; but yet, that during this uncertainty, he exhorted all that sailed thither, *ut Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem et matricem agnoscerent et tenerent*, "that in all their carriage they should acknowledge, and so hold themselves unto, the unity of the Catholic Church, which is the root and matrix of it," and the only way to avoid participation in the schism. And that this must be St. Cyprian's meaning, I shall thus prove: First, Because this could not be his meaning or intention, "That the see of Rome was the root or matrix of the Catholic Church": for if he had told them so, he had left them in as great or greater difficulty than he found them. For there was then an open and an apparent schism in the Church of Rome; two bishops, Cornelius and Novatian; two congregations, which respectively attended and observed them. So that a perplexed question must needs have divided their thoughts, Which of these two had been that root and matrix of the Catholic Church. Therefore, had St. Cyprian meant to pronounce Rome the root and matrix of the Catholic Church, he would never have done it at such a time, when Rome itself was in schism. Whereas, in the other sense,

[120] Ut ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem et matricem agnoscerent ac tenerent. [That they should recognise and cling to the root and stem of the Catholic Church.]—S. Cyprian. [*Epist.* xlv. *ad Cornelium*, olim] lib. iv. Epist. 8. [*Op.*, p. 59.]

[121] Ed. Basil. 1530. And Simancas also applies this speech of St. Cyprian to Rome: [Cyprianus quoque . . . lib. iv. fatetur, Ecclesiam Romanam esse matricem et radicem ecclesiæ Catholicæ.—Cyprian also acknowledges that the Roman Church is the stem and root of the Catholic Church. *De Catholic Institut.*] Tit. xxiv. § 17. [p. 171.]—And so also Pamelius upon this place of St. Cyprian. [Romanam Ecclesiam haud dubie intelligit, quam digno elogio ecclesiæ catholicæ radicem et matricem dicit, &c. Certainly he means the Roman Church, which he calls with righteous praise the root and stem of the Catholic Church. —*Annot.* Pamelii in loc. *Op.*, p. 86. ed. Paris. 1616.] But they wrong him.

the counsel is good and plain; namely, That they should hold themselves to the "unity and communion of the Catholic Church," which is the root of it. And then necessarily they were to suspend their communion there, till they saw how the Catholic Church did incline, to approve or disapprove the election of the one or the other. And thus St. Cyprian frees himself to Cornelius from the very least touch of schism. Secondly, Because this sense comes home to Baronius.[122] For he affirms, that St. Cyprian and his colleagues, the African bishops, did *communionem suspendere*, "suspend their communion," until they heard, by Caldonius and Fortunatus, whose the undoubted right was. So, it seems, St. Cyprian gave that counsel to these travellers, which himself followed. For if Rome, during the schism, and in so great uncertainty, had yet been *radix Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, "root of the Catholic Church of Christ," I would fain know how St. Cyprian, so great and famous an asserter of the Church's unity, durst once so much as think of "suspending communion with her." Thirdly, Because this sense will be plain also by other passages out of other epistles of St. Cyprian. For, writing to Jubaianus, an African bishop, against the Novatians, who then infested those parts, and durst rebaptize Catholic Christians—he saith thus: "But we who hold the head and root of one Church, do know for certain, and believe, that nothing of this is lawful out of the Catholic Church; and that of baptism, which is but one, we are the head, where he himself was at first baptized, when he held the ground and verity of Divine Unity."[123] Now, I conceive it is all one, or at least as argumentative to all purposes, to be *caput* or *radix baptismatis*, "head" or "root of baptism," as head or root of the Church. For there is but one baptism, as well as but one

[122] [(*Epist.* xlv.) Cum statuissemus, etc.]—Baron. *Annal.* ccliv. No. 64. where he cites this epistle.

[123] Nos autem, qui ecclesiæ unius caput et radicem tenemus, pro certo scimus, et fidimus, nihil [illi] extra Ecclesiam licere, et baptismatis, quod est unum, caput nos esse, ubi et ipse baptizatus prius fuerat, quando divinæ unitatis, et rationem et veritatem tenebat. [But we who cling to the head and root of the one Church are confident that nothing is lawful to this man outside the Church, and that, of the true baptism which is one we are the fountain head, at which he also was baptized, when he held to the reasonable and true unity.] —S. Cyprian. *Epist.* lxxiii. *ad Jubaianum*, [p. 182. col. 2.] ed. Pamelii, [Paris. 1616. In the Benedictine edition, (p. 130.) this passage is: Nos autem . . . nihil illi extra ecclesiam licere, et baptisma, quod est unum, apud nos esse, ubi, etc.—Pamelius observes that the passage is obscure. St. Augustine in one place, *contra Cresconium*. lib. ii. cap. 33. (*Op.*, tom. ix. p. 431. A.), seems to doubt the authenticity of the epistle; but in other places he admits that it is St. Cyprian's. Cf. the note by the Benedictine editor, p. 499.]

Church, and that is the entrance into this. And St. Cyprian affirms, and includes himself, *nos esse caput*, "that we are the head of baptism." Where yet, I pray observe it, he cannot by *nos*, "we," mean his own person, though, if he did, he were the more opposite to Rome; much less can he mean the Roman Church, as it is a particular, and stands separate from others. For then how could he say, *nos esse caput*, "that we are the head"? Therefore he must needs mean the unity and society of the Church Catholic, which the Novatians had then left, and whereof he and his Church were still members. Besides, most manifest it is, that he calls that Church *caput baptismatis*, "the head of baptism," where Novatian was baptized; (they are his own words;) and probable it is that was Rome, because that schismatic was a Roman priest. And yet for all this St. Cyprian says, *nos esse caput baptismatis*, "that we are the head of baptism," though he were at Carthage. By which it is plain, that as *caput* is parallel to *radix* and *matrix*; so also that by *caput*, "the head" of baptism, he includes together with Rome all the other members of the Church universal. Again, St. Cyprian writes to Cornelius, and censures the schismatical carriage of the Novatians at Rome; and tells him farther, that he had sent Caldonius and Fortunatus "to labour peace in that Church, that so they might be reduced to and composed in the unity of the Catholic Church. But, because the obstinate and inflexible pertinacy of the other party had not only refused *radicis et matris sinum*, 'the bosom of their mother and embracings of their root,' but the schism increasing and growing raw to the worse, hath set up a bishop to itself," etc.[124] Where it is observable, and I think plain, that St. Cyprian employed his

[124] [Miseramus nuper collegas nostros Caldonium et Fortunatum ut non tantum persuasione literarum nostrarum, sed præsentia sua et consilio omnium vestrum eniterentur quantum possent et] elaborarent, ut ad catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem scissi corporis membra componerent, et Christianæ caritatis vinculo copularent. Sed quoniam diversæ partis obstinata et inflexibilis pertinacia non tantum radicis et matris sinum atque complexum recusavit, sed etiam gliscente et in pejus recrudescente discordia, episcopum sibi constituit. [We had sent of late our colleagues Caldonius and Fortunatus, that they not only by our persuasive letters, but by their presence and by the counsel of you all, might strive as far as they could and labour in order that they might bring into the unity of the Catholic Church the members of the divided body, and might join them together by the bond of Christian unity. But since the obstinate and inflexible pertinacity of the opposite party has not only rejected the love and the embrace of the root and mother, but has gone so far as to appoint for itself a bishop, and discord is ever on the increase and ever becoming more wicked, etc., etc.]—S. Cyprian. [*Epist.* xlii. *ad Cornelium*, olim] lib. ii. Epist. 10. [*Op.*, p. 56.]

[CHAPTER XIV.] legates, not to bring the Catholic Church to the communion of Rome, but Rome to the Catholic Church; or to bring the Novatians not only to communicate with Cornelius, but with the Church universal; which was therefore "head and root," in St. Cyprian's judgment, even to Rome itself, as well as to all other great, ancient, or even Apostolical, Churches. And this is yet more plain by the sequel. For when those his legates had laboured to bring those schismatics to the unity of the Catholic Church, yet he complains their labour was lost. And why? Why, because *recusabant radicis et matris sinum*, "they refused the bosom of the root and the mother." Therefore it must needs be, that, in St. Cyprian's sense, these two, *unitas Catholicæ Ecclesiæ*, "the unity of the Catholic Church," and *radicis* or *matricis sinus* or *complexus*, the "bosom" or "embracing of the root" or the "mother," are all one. And then *radix* and *matrix* are not words by which he expresses the Roman see in particular, but he denotes by them the "unity of the Church Catholic." Fourthly, Because Tertullian[125] seems to me to agree in the same sense: for, saith he, "these so many and great Churches founded by the Apostles," taken all of them together, "are that one Church from the Apostles, out of which are all. So all are first, and all apostolic, while they all allow and prove *unam unitatem*, 'one unity.'" Nor can any possibly understand this of any particular Church, but subordinately. As St. Gregory Nazianzen says, the

[125] [Itaque] tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ, et omnes Apostolicæ, dum unam omnes probant unitatem. [Thus, those great and numerous Churches form that one first Church founded by the Apostles, from which all have sprung. Therefore all are the first and all are Apostolic, so long as all support one unity.]—Tertullian. *de præscript. advers. Hær.* cap. xx. [The last clause in this passage is in Rigalt's edition: Sic omnes prima, et Apostolicæ, dum una omnes probant unitatem. So all are the first Church and all Apostolic; so long as all together exhibit unity.—*Op.*, p. 209. A. Migne, i. 32.] —[. . . Apostolos primum institutis per Judæam ecclesiis, in orbem deinde profectos, apud unamquamque civitatem ecclesias condidisse, quæ vocatæ sint Apostolicæ, a quibus cæteræ mutuo sumpserint doctrinam.] Porro unam esse primam Apostolicam, a qua reliquæ. *Hanc* nulli loco affigit. [The Apostles, after the Churches throughout Judaea had first been established, next went into the world and founded in every city Churches, which have been called Apostolic, from which the rest in turn received their doctrine. So he asserts there was one first Apostolic Church, by which the rest were founded. This Church, however, he attaches to no particular place.]—B[eatus] Rhenanus, *Annotat. in Argument.* [*præfix.*] Tertullian. *lib. de præscriptione* [*Hæret. Op.*, p. 67. D. ed. De la Barre, Paris, 1582.] *Nulli loco*; therefore not at Rome. But these words, "Hanc nulli loco affigit," *deleantur*, says the Spanish inquisition upon Rhenanus, printed at Madrid, an. 1584. [Repeated also in the *Index Expurgatorius* of Madrid, ed. 1667. p. 94. col. 1.]

Church of Cæsarea was *mater*, "the mother, of almost all Churches";[126] which must needs be understood of some neighbouring churches, not of the whole Catholic Church. And where Pamelius speaks[127] of "original" and "mother" Churches, he names six, "and others," and Rome in the last place. Therefore certainly no particular Church can be the root or matrix of the Catholic; but she is rooted in her own unity, down from the Apostles, and no where else *extra Deum*. And this is farther manifest by the irreligious act of the Emperor Adrian; for he, intending to root out the faith of Christ, took this course: he consecrated *simulacrum Jovis*, "the image of Jupiter," in the very place where Christ suffered; and profaned Bethlehem with the temple of Adonis—"to this end, that the root, as it were, and the foundation of the Church might be taken away, if in those places idols might be worshipped in which Christ Himself was born, and suffered,"[128] etc. By which it is most evident, that either

[126] St. Gregory Nazianzen says the Church of Cæsarea was mater prope omnium Ecclesiarum. [Mother of almost all the Churches.]—[S. Gregor. Nazianzen.] *Epist.* xviii. [nunc xli. al. xxii. *ad Cæsarienses*. *Op.*, tom. ii. p. 36. A. πάσης μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίας φροντιστέον, ὡς Χριστοῦ σώματος, μάλιστα δὲ τῆς ὑμετέρας, ἡ μητὴρ σχεδὸν ἁπάντων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἥν τε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καὶ νῦν ἐστι, καὶ νομίζεται, καὶ πρὸς ἣν τὸ κοινὸν βλέπει, ὡς κέντρῳ κύκλος περιγραφόμενος, κ.τ.λ. We must take heed to the whole Church as being the body of Christ, but most of all to yours, which, being the Mother of almost all the Churches, hath existed from the beginning, and still exists, and is so considered, and towards it the mass of Christians look, as a circle when it has been drawn all round looks towards its centre.]

[127] [Quod huc autem solum pertineat, *Ecclesiæ matrices fidei* vocantur, unde fides Christi primum venit ad nos: et *originales fidei*, a quibus diffusa per orbem fides originem sumpsit. Exemplaria veræ fidei scilicet, ut fuit Hierosolymitana, Antiochena, Corinthia, Philippensis, Ephesina, Romana, et aliæ. And this belongs to them alone, to be called the stem Churches of the faith, since the faith of Christ first came from them to us, and the original Churches of the faith, from which the faith which has been spread over the world took its origin. These are examples of the true faith, for instance, the Church of Jerusalem, that of Antioch, of Corinth, of Philippi, of Ephesus, of Rome, and others.] —Pamel. [*Annotat.*] in Tertullian. *lib. de præscript. adversus Hæreticos*. cap. xxi. No. 129. [apud *Op.*, Tertullian. p. 254. col. 1. C. ed. Colon. 1617.]

[128] [Nam Hadrianus Imperator existimans se fidem Christianam loci injuria peremturum, in loco passionis simulacrum Jovis consecravit: et Bethlehem Adonidis fano profanata est:] ut quasi radix et fundamentum Ecclesiæ tolleretur, si in iis locis idola colerentur, in quibus Christus natus est [ut pateretur, passus est ut resurgeret, surrexit ut regnaret, judicatus ut judicaret. For the Emperor Hadrian thought he would destroy the faith of the Christians by insulting the sacred site, and therefore consecrated the image of Jupiter on the site of the Passion; and Bethlehem was profaned by a shrine of Adonis, so that the root, as it were, and the foundation of the Church should be removed; since idols would be worshipped on the very spots in which Christ was born that He might suffer, in which He suffered that He might rise again, in which He rose that He might reign, in which He was judged that He might judge.]—S. Paulinus, (*Epist.* xi. *ad Severum*,) [xxxi. § 3. *Op.*, tom. i. p. 194.]

[CHAPTER XIV.] Jerusalem was the root of the Catholic Church, if any particular Church were so; or rather, that Adrian was deceived, as being an heathen he well might, in that he thought the Universal Church had any particular or local root of its being; or that he could destroy it all, by laying it waste in any one place whatsoever. And St. Augustine, I think, is full for this, That the Catholic Church must have a Catholic "root," or "matrix," too. For he tells us "That all heresies whatsoever went out *de illa*, 'out of the Catholic Church.'"[129] For *de illa*, there, can be out of no other; for "all heresies" did not go out of any one particular Church. He goes on: "They were cut off *de vite*, 'from this Catholic vine' still, as unprofitable branches; *ipsa autem*, 'but this' Catholic Church remains *in radice sua*, 'in its own root,' in its own vine, in its own charity," which must needs be as ample and as catholic as itself; or else, were it any particular, "all heretical branches" could not be cut off from one "root." And St. Augustine says again, "That the Donatists did not consider that they were cut off from the root of the Eastern Churches":[130] where you see again it is still but "one root" of many Churches; and that if any man will have a "particular root" of the Catholic Church, he must have it in the East, not in the West at Rome. And now, lastly, besides this out of St. Cyprian, to prove his own meaning—and sure he is the best interpreter of himself,—and other assisting proofs, it is most evident that in the prime and principal sense, the Catholic Church and her unity is the "head, root, or matrix" of Rome, and all other particular Churches, and not Rome, or any other particular, the head, root, or matrix of it. For there is a double root of the Church, as there is of all things else: that is, *radix essentiæ*, the "root, head, or matrix of its essence"; and this is the prime sense; for essence and being is first in all things: and then there is *radix existentiæ*, "the root of its existence" and formal being; which always presupposes being, and is therefore a sense less principal. Now to apply this. The Catholic or

[129] Hæreses omnes de illa exierunt, tanquam sarmenta inutilia de vite præcisa: ipsa autem manet in radice sua, [in vite sua, in caritate sua.]—[From her all heresies went out, like useless shoots cut off from the vine, but she herself remains in her own root, in her own vine, in her own love.]—S. Augustin. *de Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, lib. i. cap. 6. [*Op.*, tom. vi. col. 554. E.]

[130] Pars [autem] Donati non considerat ab illa radice orientalium ecclesiarum se esse præcisam. [But the party of Donatus did not think that they had been cut off from the root of the Eastern Churches.]—S. Augustin. *Epist.* [lii. *ad Severinum*, olim] clxx. § 2. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 119. B. Migne, ii. 194.]

Universal Church is, and must needs be, the root of essence and being to Rome, and all other particulars; and this is the principal root, head, or matrix, that gives being: and Rome, but with all other particular Churches, and no more than other patriarchal Churches, was and is *radix existentiæ*, the "root of the Church's existence." And this agrees with that known and received rule in art, "That universals give essence to their particulars, and particulars supply their universals with existence." For as Socrates, and every particular man, borrow their essence from the species and definition of a man, which is universal; but this universal nature and being of man hath no actual existence but in Socrates and all other particular men; so the Church of Rome, and every other particular Church in the world, receive their very essence and being of a church from the definition of the Catholic Universal Church of Christ; but this universal nature and being of the Church hath no actual existence but in Rome and all other particular Churches, and equal existence in all her particulars. And should all the particular Churches in the world fall away from Christ, save only one,—which God forbid!—yet the nature, essence, and being of the Universal Church would both exist and subsist in that one particular. Out of all which to me most clear it is, That for the Church's being, the Catholic Church, and that in unity, (for *ens et unum*, "being," and "being one," are convertible,) is *radix*, the "root, head, matrix, fountain, or original," call it what you will, of Rome, and all other particular Churches; but Rome is no more than other Churches the root or matrix of the Catholic Church's existence, or place of her actual residence: and this I say for her existence only, not the purity or form of her existence, which is not here considered. But if the Catholic she be not, nor the "root" of the Catholic Church, yet "Apostolic" I hope she is. Indeed, Apostolic she is, as being the see of one, and he a prime, Apostle;[181] but then not Apostolic,

[181] Not as Bellarmine would have it, with a Hinc dicitur Apostolica, quia in ea successio episcoporum ab apostolis deducta est usque ad nos. [It is called Apostolic for this reason, that in it the succession of Bishops has been directly handed down from the Apostles to our own time.]—Bellarmin. *de Notis Eccl.* lib. iv. cap. 8. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 178. D.] For, by this reason, neither Jerusalem nor Antioch were in their times Apostolic Churches; because succession of bishops hath not succeeded in them to this day. [Neque enim de presbyteris, aut diaconis, aut inferioris ordinis clericis, sed] de collegis agebatur, qui possent [aliorum collegarum] judicio, [præsertim] *apostolicarum ecclesiarum*, causam suam integram reservare. [For it was no question of priests, or of deacons, or of clergy of inferior rank, but of colleagues (and equals, *i.e.* Bishops)

[CHAPTER XIV.]

as the Church is called in the Creed, from all the Apostles—no, nor the "only Apostolic."[182] "Visible," I may not deny, God hath hitherto preserved her, but for a better end, doubtless, than

who could by the decision of other colleagues, specially the bishops of the Apostolic Churches, keep their case secure.]—S. Augustin. *Epist.* [xliii. *ad Glorium et Eleusium*, olim] clxii. [§ 7. *Op.*, tom. ii. col. 91. F.]—Johann. de Turrecremata enumerat sex verbi hujus significationes. Quarum prima est *apostolica*; dicitur quia in apostolis, etc., initiata est. Hos enim instituit quasi fundamentum ecclesiæ, etc. [Turrecremata counts up six uses of this word; of which he says the first is apostolic; it is used because the Church was commenced in the Apostles. For Christ appointed these to be, as it were, the foundation of the Church.]—Johann. de Turrecremat. *Summ. de Eccles.* lib. i. cap. 18.—Et quia originem sumpsit ab apostolis, etc. [And because the Church took her origin from the Apostles.]—*Ibid.*—Ubi dicit etiam S. Patres apposuisse hanc vocem (*apostolicam*) in symbolo suo, supra symbolum apostolorum. [Where he says further, that the Holy Fathers placed this word (apostolic) in their creed at the top of the Apostles' Creed.]—*Ibid.*

[182] [Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum: evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo] Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ [census suos deferunt: sic]ut Smyrnæorum [ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert: sicut Romanorum, Clementem a Petro ordinatum itidem (edit)]: proinde utique et cæteræ exhibent quos ab Apostolis in episcopatum constitutos [Apostolici seminis traduces habeant. Let them then produce the origins of their Churches; let them unroll the order of their Bishops, descending through their successions from the beginning, by such a descent that the first bishop shall have as his ordainer and predecessor one of the Apostles, or one of the Apostolic men who moreover persevered to the end with the Apostles. For in this fashion the Apostolic Churches trace their lists, as the Church of Smyrna relates that Polycarp was placed there by John; as the Church of Rome in the same way relates that Clement was ordained by Peter; and in the same fashion the rest of the Churches explain who the men were who were appointed to be their Bishops by the Apostles, and through whom is derived the Apostolic seed.]—Tertullian. *de præscript. advers. Hæreticos.* cap. xxxii. [*Op.*, p. 213. B. Migne, ii. 44.] [Age jam qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ,] percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, . . . habes Corinthum. . . . Philippos, [habes] Thessalonicenses. . . . Ephesum. [Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes] Romam, [unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est. Come now, you who want to exercise your curiosity better about the affairs of your salvation, run over the Apostolic Churches. In Greece you have Corinth . . .; in Macedonia you have Philippi, . . . Thessalonica . . .; in Asia you have Ephesus. If you are near Italy you have Rome, from which we also have authority ready to hand.]—*Ibid.* cap. xxxvi. [p. 215. A. Migne, ii. 49. He goes on to enlarge on Rome's connexion with Peter, Paul, and lastly with John.]—Et Pamelius enumerat Hierosolymitanam, Antiochenam, Corinthiam, Philippensem, Ephesinam, Romanam. [And Pamelius enumerates the Churches of Jerusalem, of Antioch, of Corinth, of Philippi, of Ephesus, of Rome.—Pamel. *ibid.* cap. xxi. No. 129. *Ubi sup.* p. 429. note 127.] And it may be observed, that so long ago Tertullian, and so lately Pamelius, should reckon Rome last. Cæteræ [exinde] ecclesiæ [mutuatæ sunt, et quotidie mutuantur ut ecclesiæ fiant: ac] per hoc et ipsæ Apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. [The rest of the Churches borrowed from them, and borrow to-day that they may become Churches; and for this reason they also themselves are reckoned Apostolic, as the offspring of Apostolic Churches.]—Tertullian. *ibid.* cap. xx. [p. 208. D. Migne, ii. 32.]

they turn it to. But "infallible" she was never. Yet if that Lady did, as the Jesuit in his close avows, or others will, rest satisfied with it, who can help it? Sure, none but God. And, by A. C.'s leave, this, which I said is no work for my pen, cannot be learned—no, not of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, much less of the Roman. For though the foundation be one and the same, and sufficiently known by Scripture and the Creeds, yet for the building upon the foundation, the adding to it, the detracting from it, the joining other things with it, the grating upon it; and each of these may be damnable to some, and not to others, according to the knowledge, wisdom, means of information, which some have and others want; and according to the ignorance, simplicity, and want of information, which some others have, and cannot help; and according to the negligence, contempt, wilfulness, and malice, with obstinacy, which some have against the known truth; and all or some of these in different degrees in every particular man: and that in the whole latitude of mankind, from the most wise and learned in the school of Christ, to the simplest idiot, that hath been so happy as to be initiated into the faith by baptism. Now, the Church hath not this knowledge of all particulars, men, and conditions, nor can she apply the conditions to the men; and therefore cannot teach just how far every man must believe, as it relates to the possibility or impossibility of his salvation, in every particular. And that which the Church cannot teach, men cannot learn of her. She can teach the foundation, and men were happy if they would learn it, and the Church more happy would she teach nothing but that, as necessary to salvation; for certainly nothing but that is necessary.

[CHAPTER XV.

Effect of the Conference on the Countess—Conclusion.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.

The Countess came to Church after the Conference. If she was insincere she was wrong, but it would be all a part of the Jesuit teaching. The Jesuit claims that Laud has shown no superstition and no error in the Roman Church. Laud recounts the errors once more. The Jesuit maintains that Laud shows pride in declaring that the Roman Church is full of error and superstition. Laud answers that he strives not to be proud, and that he will show humility by obeying a General Council. But he does not and he will not accept Papal infallibility. The Jesuit quotes Eph. iv. 11*: this cannot be twisted into Papal infallibility. Nor is it true that Rome has always held the same doctrine; it has made great changes. In visible succession the Greek Church is as clear as the Latin. If Irenæus appeals to the Episcopal succession at Rome, he appeals also to the succession in Asia. The most important succession is that of Verity in doctrine. Stapleton has failed to prove that this is true of Rome. He acknowledges that the signs of the succession must be unity and faith. Now at Rome they have had more schisms than have been in other Churches; the Popes have also introduced gross superstitions.*

The Jesuit finally propounds as an alternative either an Infallible Pope or a condition in which every individual decides and judges for himself. Laud responds by a third choice, in which an individual may not decide, but Scripture interpreted by the Primitive Church, and by a free and lawful General Council. He desires now to leave controversy. He is too old for it and too busy. The one thing he desires is that God would grant the blessed meeting of truth and peace in His Church.]

Now then, whereas, after all this, the Jesuit tells us that

ff. Upon this and the precedent Conferences, the Lady rested in judgment fully satisfied [in her judgment,] as she told a

confident friend, of the truth of the Roman Church's faith. Yet upon frailty, and fear to offend the King, she yielded to go to church; for which she was after very sorry, as some of her friends can testify. SECTION XXXIX.

§. I. This is all personal. And how that honourable Lady was then settled "in conscience," how "in judgment," I know not. This, I think, is made clear enough, That that which you said in this and the precedent Conferences could settle neither, unless in some that were settled or settling before. As little do I know what she "told any confident friend" of her approving the Roman cause; no more whether it were "frailty" or "fear," or other motive, that made her yield to go to church; nor how sorry she was for it, nor who can testify that sorrow. This I am sure of: if she repent, and God forgive her other sins, she will more easily be able to answer for her "coming to church," than for her "leaving of the Church of England," and following the superstitions and errors which the Roman Church hath added in point of faith and the worship of God. For the Lady was then living when I answered thus. § 39.

II. Now, whereas I said the Lady would far more easily be able to answer for her coming to church than for her leaving the Church of England: to this A. C. excepts, and says, "that I neither prove, nor can prove, that it is lawful for one, persuaded especially as the Lady was, to go to the Protestant Church." There is a great deal of cunning, and as much malice, in this passage, but I shall easily pluck the sting out of the tail of this wasp. And, first, I have proved it already, through this whole discourse, and therefore can prove it, that the Church of England is an orthodox Church; and therefore with the same labour it is proved that men may lawfully go unto it, and communicate with it—for so a man not only may but ought to do with an orthodox Church: and a Romanist may communicate with the Church of England without any offence in the nature of the thing thereby incurred; but if his conscience, through misinformation, check at it, he should do well in that case rather to inform his conscience, than forsake any orthodox Church whatsoever. Secondly, A. C. tells me plainly, "that I cannot prove, that a man, so persuaded as the Lady was, may go to the Protestant church"; that is, that a Roman Catholic may not go to the Protestant church. Why, I never went about to prove that a Roman Catholic, being and A. C. p. 73.

[Chapter XV.] controversies," that I absolutely make a lawful and free General Council judge of controversies, by and according to the Scriptures.[4] And this I learned from St. Augustine, with this, "That ever the Scripture is to have the prerogative above the Council."[5]

A. C. p. 63. Nay, A. C. should remember here, that he himself taxes me for giving too much power to a General Council, and binding men to a strict obedience to it, even in the case of error.[6] And therefore, sure, most innocent I am of the intolerable pride which he is pleased to charge upon me; and he, of all men, most unfit to

A. C. p. 73. charge it. Secondly, A. C. will have my "pride" appear in this, "that I take authority to censure all for error and superstition, which suits not with my own fancy." But how can this possibly be, since I submit my judgment in all humility to the Scripture, interpreted by the Primitive Church, and, upon new and necessary doubts, to the judgment of a "lawful and free General Council"? And this I do from my very heart, and do abhor, in matters of religion, that my own, or any private man's, fancy should take any place, and least of all against things generally held or practised by the Universal Church; which to oppose in such things, is certainly, as St. Augustine calls it, *insolentissimæ insaniæ*,[7] an attempt of "most insolent madness." But those things which the Church of England charges upon the Roman party to be superstitious and erroneous, are not held, or practised, in or by the Universal Church generally, either for time or place. And now I would have A. C. consider how justly all this may be turned upon himself. For he hath nothing to pretend that there are not gross superstitions and errors in the Roman persuasion, unless by "intolerable pride" he will make himself and his party "judge of controversies"—as in effect he doth, for he will be judged by none but the pope, and a Council of his ordering—or unless he will take authority to free from superstition and error "whatsoever suits with his fancy," though it be even superstition itself; and run cross to what hath been generally held in the Catholic Church of Christ, yea, though to do so be, in St. Augustine's judgment, "most insolent madness." And A. C. spake in this

[4] Sect. xxxiii. [*vide supra*, pp. 263—330.] Sect. xxvi. Nos. 1—11. [*vide supra*, pp. 221—240.]

[5] Præp onitur Scriptura, etc. [Scripture is put first.]—S. Augustin. *de Bapt. contra Donat.* lib. ii. cap. 3. [*Op.*, tom. ix. col. 98. A. Migne, ix. 128, *ubi sup.* p. 232. note 26.]

[6] Sect. xxxii. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 262.]

[7] S. Augustin. *Epist.* [liv. *ad Januarium*, olim] cxviii. cap. 5. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 126. C. Migne, ii. 202, *ubi sup.* p. 155. note 21.]

most properly, when he called it "taking of authority"; for the Bishop and Church of Rome have in this particular, of judging controversies, indeed taken that authority to themselves, which neither Christ nor His Church Catholic did ever give them. Here the Conference ended with this conclusion. SECTION XXXIX.

V. And as I hope God hath given that Lady mercy, so I heartily pray that He will be pleased to give all of you a light of His truth, and a love to it, that you may no longer be made instruments of the pope's boundless ambition, and this most unchristian, brain-sick[8] device, "That in all controversies of the faith he is infallible, and that by way of inspiration and prophecy in the conclusion which he gives." To the due consideration of which, and God's mercy in Christ, I leave you.

VI. To this conclusion of the Conference between me and the Jesuit, A. C. says not much: but that which he doth say is either the self-same which he hath said already, or else is quite mistaken in the business. That which he hath said already is this: "That in matters of faith we are to submit our judgments to such doctors and pastors as, by visible continual succession without change, brought the faith down from Christ and His Apostles to these our days, and shall so carry it to the end of the world. And that this succession is not found in any other Church differing in doctrine from the Roman Church." Now to this I have given a full answer already,[9] and therefore will not trouble the reader with needless and troublesome repetition. Then he brings certain places of Scripture to prove the pope's infallibility. But to all these places I have likewise answered before;[10] and therefore A. C. needed not to repeat them again, as if they had been unanswerable. A. C. p. 73.

VII. One place of Scripture only A. C. had not urged before, either for proof of this "continued visible succession," or for the Pope's infallibility. Nor doth A. C. distinctly set down by which of the two he will prove it. The place is Ephes. iv.: "Christ ascending, gave some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, etc. for the edification of the Church." Now if he do mean to prove the Pope's infallibility by this place, in his pastoral judgment, truly I do not see how this can possibly be collected thence:—Christ[11] gave some to be apostles A. C. p. 73. Ephes. iv. 11.

[8] Sect. xxxiii. No. 6. [*vide supra*, p. 290.]

[9] Sect. xxxvii. Nos. 3, 4. [*vide supra*, p. 373.]

[10] Sect. xxv. No. 5. [*vide supra*, p. 186.]

[11] [Respondeo,] Pontificatum summum diserte positum ab Apostolo in

[CHAPTER XV.]

for the edification of His Church: Therefore St. Peter and all his successors are infallible in their pastoral judgment. And if he mean to prove the "continued visible succession, which," he saith, "is to be found in no Church but the Roman," there is a little more show, but to no more purpose. A little more show: because it is added, "That the apostles and prophets, etc. shall continue at their work," and that must needs be by succession, "till we all meet in unity and perfection of Christ." But to no more[1] purpose: for it is not said that they, or their successors, should continue at this their work in a "personal, uninterrupted succession," in any one particular Church, Roman or other: nor ever will A. C. be able to prove that such a succession is necessary in any one particular place. And if he could, yet his own words tell us, the personal succession is nothing, "if the faith be not brought down without change from Christ and His Apostles to this day, and so to the end of the world." Now here is a piece of cunning too, "The faith brought down unchanged." For if A. C. mean by "the faith," the Creed, and that in letter; it is true, the Church of Rome hath received, and brought down, the faith unchanged from Christ and His Apostles to these our days. But then it is apparently false, That no Church differing from the Roman in doctrine, hath kept that faith unchanged, and that by a visible and continued succession. For the Greek Church differs from the Roman in doctrine, and yet hath so kept that faith unchanged. But if he mean by "faith unchanged, and yet brought down in a continual visible succession," not only the Creed in letter, but in sense too —and not that only, but all the doctrinal points about the faith,

Ephes. iv. 13.

[1] [more . . . *caret* Edit. 1686.]

A. C. p. 73.

illis verbis, *Eph.* iv. 11: et in illis clarioribus, *1 Cor.* xii. 28: Ipse posuit in Ecclesia primum Apostolos. [I answer that the office of Supreme pontiff has been luminously established by the Apostles in those words, *Eph.* iv. 11: and in those still plainer words, *1 Cor.* xii. 28. "He Himself established in the Church first Apostles."]—Bellarmin. *de Rom. Pont.* lib. i. cap. 9. § 45. [*Op.*, tom. i. col. 537. D. *ubi sup.* p. 192. note 25.] And he gives an excellent reason for it: Si quidem summa potestas ecclesiastica non solum data est Petro, sed etiam aliis Apostolis. [Since the highest power in the Church was given not only to Peter, but also to the other Apostles.]—*Ibid.* So belike by this reason the Apostle doth clearly express the Popedom, because all the rest of the Apostles had as much ecclesiastical power as St. Peter had. But then Bellarmine would salve it up with this, That this power is given Petro, ut ordinario pastori, cui [perpetuo] succederetur, aliis vero, tanquam delegatis, quibus non succederetur. [To Peter as to a regular pastor, who would have continuous successors; but to the rest as delegates who would have no successors.]—*Ibid.* But this is mere begging of the question, and will never be granted unto him. And in the mean time, we have his absolute confession for the other, That the "supreme ecclesiastical power" was not in St. Peter alone, but in "all the Apostles."

which have been determined in all such Councils as the present Church of Rome allows—as most certainly he doth so mean,[12] and it is the controversy between us;—then it is most certain, and most apparent to any understanding man, that reads antiquity with an impartial eye, that a visible continual succession of doctors and pastors have not brought down the faith, in this sense, from Christ and His Apostles to these days of ours, in the Roman Church. And that I may not be thought to say and not to prove, I give instance. And with this, that if A. C., or any Jesuit, can prove, That by a "visible continued succession" from Christ and His Apostles to this day, either transubstantiation in the eucharist, or the eucharist in one kind, or purgatory, or worship of images, or the intention of the priest of necessity in baptism, or the power of the pope over a General Council, or his infallibility with or without it, or his power to depose princes, or the public prayers of the Church in an unknown tongue—with divers other points,—have been so taught, I, for my part, will give the cause. Besides, for succession, in the general, I shall say this: It is a great happiness where it may be had "visible" and "continued," and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers, that makes "local, personal, visible," and "continued succession," a "necessary sign," or "mark" of the "true Church" in any one place. And where Vincentius Lirinensis calls for "antiquity, universality," and "consent," as great notes of truth,[13] he hath not one word of "succession." And for that great place in Irenæus, where that ancient Father reckons the succession of the Bishops of Rome to Eleutherius,[14] who sat in his time, and saith, "That this is a most full and ample proof or ostension, *vivificatricem fidem*, 'that the

[12] And so also Bellarmine, Sexta nota est conspiratio in doctrina cum ecclesia antiqua. [The sixth note is its agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church.]—*De Notis Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 9. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 184. C.]

[13] [In ipsa item Catholica ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est: hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quod omnia fere Universaliter comprehendit, sed hoc ita demum fiat; si sequamur Universitatem, Antiquitatem, Consensionem. In the Catholic Church special pains must be taken, that we hold that, which has been believed in all places, at all times, and by all men. For this is really and truly Catholic, as the very force and meaning of its name shows, because it includes everything Universally; but this Universality will actually be accomplished; if we follow what is universal, what is ancient, what all agree upon.]—Vin. Lirinens. *contra Hæreses*, cap. iii. [p. 6.]

[14] [Bishop of Rome, 177. to 192. A.D.]

[CHAPTER XV.]

living and life-giving faith,' is from the Apostles to this day conserved and delivered in truth,"[15]—"and of which place Bellarmine[16] boasts so much,—most manifest it is in the very same place, that Irenæus stood as much upon the succession of the Churches then in Asia, and of Smyrna—though that no prime Apostolical Church—where Polycarpus sat bishop, as of the succession at Rome."[17] By which it is most manifest, that it is

[15] Hac ordinatione et successione, ea quæ est ab Apostolis in ecclesia traditio, et veritatis præconatio pervenit usque ad nos. Et est plenissima hæc ostensio, unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata, et tradita in veritate. [By the same ordination, and by the same succession, the Tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles and the preaching of the truth have reached us; and this shows most clearly that the faith which gives life is one and the same, which has been kept from the days of the Apostles until now, and handed down in truth.]—S. Iren. *advers. Hær.* lib. iii. cap. 3. [§ 3. *Op.*, p. 176. ed. Benedict. et p. 203. ed. Grabe. The second clause of this passage is not extant in the Greek; the first is: *τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διδαχῇ, (al. διαδοχῇ) ἥτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παράδοσις, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυγμα κατήντηκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς.* Migne, vii. 851.]

[16] [Ac propterea omnes veteres hac successione, tanquam argumento evidentissimo, usi sunt ad veram Ecclesiam ostendendam. Irenæus, lib. iii. cap. 3. enumerat Episcopos Romanos a Petro usque ad Eleutherium, qui suo tempore sedebat, ac dicit,] Per hanc successionem confundi omnes hæreticos. [And therefore all the ancient writers have used this succession as a most clear argument, to show the true Church. Irenæus, Bk. iii. cap. 3. enumerates the Roman bishops from Peter to Eleutherius, who occupied the see in his time, and says that heretics are put to confusion by this succession.]—Bellarmin. *de Notis Eccles.* lib. iv. cap. 8. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 178. D.] There is no such word found in Irenæus, as "per hanc successionem," or, "hac successione," in the Church of Rome only, which is Bellarmine's sense; but by succession in general, in other Churches, as well as in Rome. [The passage to which Bellarmine alludes, occurs previously in the chapter: Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximæ, et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem, et annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo, vel per sibi placentia, (*al.* placentiam) vel vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præterquam oportet colligunt. But since it is too long in such a volume as this to enumerate the succession in all the Churches, we choose the greatest and most ancient and best known Church which was founded and organised at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, and we point to the tradition which it has from the Apostles, and to the faith which it has announced to men coming through a succession of bishops to our own time; and so we put to confusion all those who in some manner either by their own preference, or vain glory, or their blindness or wrong opinion, assemble in unauthorised meetings.—S. Irenæus, *ibid.* § 3. *Op.*, p. 175. ed. Benedict. et p. 201. ed. Grabe, *ubi sup.* p. 208. note 88. Migne, vii. 848.]

[17] Testimonium his perhibent quæ sunt in Asia ecclesiæ omnes, et qui usque adhuc successerunt Polycarpo. —S. Irenæus, *adversus Hæres.* lib. iii. cap. 3. [§ 4. *Op.*, p. 177. ed. Benedict. et p. 203. ed. Grabe. Migne, vii. 852. *μαρτυροῦσιν τούτοις αἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι, καὶ οἱ μέχρι νῦν διαδεδεγμένοι τὸν Πολύκαρπον.* All the Churches in Asia give their witness to these, and the Bishops who have succeeded Polycarp to the present

not "personal succession" only, and that tied to one place, that the Fathers meant; but they taught that the faith was delivered over by "succession," in "some places or other," still to their present time; and so doubtless shall be, till time be no more. I say, "the faith," but not every opinion, true or false, that in tract of time shall cleave to the faith. And to the faith itself, and all its fundamentals, we can show as good and full a succession as you; and we pretend no otherwise to it than you do, save that we take in the Greeks, which you do not; only we reject your gross superstitions, to which you can show no succession from the Apostles, either at Rome or elsewhere, much less any one uninterrupted. And therefore he might have held his peace that says, "It is evident that the Roman Catholic Church only hath [A. C. p. 6.] had a constant and uninterrupted succession of pastors, and doctors, and tradition of doctrine from age to age"; for most evident it is, that the tradition of doctrine hath received both addition and alteration since the first five hundred years, in which Bellarmine[18] confesses, and Bishop Jewell maintains, the Church's doctrine was apostolical.

VIII. And once more, before I leave this point: most evident it is, That the "succession" which the Fathers meant, is not tied to place or person, but it is tied to the "verity of doctrine." For so Tertullian expressly: "Beside the order of bishops running down" in succession "from the beginning, there is required

time.] — Constat [proinde] omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis Ecclesiis Apostolicis matricibus et originalibus fidei conspiret, veritati deputandam. [It is certain that all the doctrine which agrees with the Apostolic Churches which are stems and originals of the faith must be considered true.]—Tertullian. *de præscript. adversus Hæret.* cap. xxi. [Migne, ii. 33. *ubi sup.* p. 424. note 119.]—[Ad hanc itaque formam probabuntur ab illis Ecclesiis, quæ licet nullum ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis, auctorem suum proferant, ut multo] posteriores, [quæ denique quotidie instituuntur: tamen in eadem fide conspirantes,] non minus Apostolicæ deputantur, pro consanguinitate doctrinæ. [And in this rule they will be tested by those Churches, which, without putting forward any Apostle or Apostolic man as their founder, because they are much later—indeed, they are being founded every day—yet agree in the same faith and are none the less reckoned as Apostolic on account of their relationship in doctrine.]—Tertullian. *ibid.* cap. xxxii. [*Op.*, p. 213. C. Migne, ii. 45.]—Ecclesia non in parietibus consistit, etc. Ecclesia autem ibi est, ubi fides vera est. [The Church does not consist of walls, etc. But the Church is there where the true faith is.] —[Pseudo-] S. Hieronym. [*Breviar.*] *in Ps.* cxxxiii. [*ubi sup.* p. 354. note 41.]

[18] [Certum autem est] antiquam ecclesiam primis quingentis annis veram ecclesiam fuisse, et proinde apostolicam doctrinam retinuisse. [But it is certain that the ancient Church for the first 500 years was the true Church, and likewise kept the Apostolic doctrine.]—Bellarmin. *de Notis Ecclas.* lib. iv. cap. 9. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 184. C.]

[CHAPTER XV.]

consanguinitas doctrinæ, 'that the doctrine be allied in blood' to that of Christ and His Apostles."[19] So that if the doctrine be no kin to Christ, all the "succession" become strangers, what nearness soever they pretend. And Irenæus speaks plainer than he: "We are to obey those presbyters, which, together with the succession of their bishoprics, have received *charisma veritatis*, 'the gift of truth.'"[20] Now Stapleton, being pressed hard with these two authorities, first confesses expressly, "that succession, as it is a note of the true Church, is neither a succession in place only, nor of persons only,[1] but it must be of true and sound doctrine also."[21] And had he stayed here, no man could have said better; but then he saw well he must quit his great "note" of the "Church succession": that he durst not do; therefore he begins to cast about how he may answer these Fathers, and yet maintain "succession." Secondly, therefore, he tells us, that that which these Fathers say do nothing weaken "succession," but that it shall still be a main "note" of the "true Church," and in that sense which he would have it; and his reason is: "Because sound doctrine is indivisible from true and lawful succession."[22] Where you shall see this great clerk—for so he was—not able to stand to himself, when he hath forsaken truth. For it is not long after that he tells us, "That the people are led along, and judge the doctrine, by the pastors; but when the Church comes to examine, she judges the pastors by their doctrine." And this, he says, is necessary, "because a man may become, of a pastor, a

[1 [nor of person only .... Edit. 1673. nor person only .... Edit. 1686.]

[19] Ad hanc [itaque] formam probabuntur ab illis Ecclesiis, quæ licet nullum ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis auctorem suum proferant, ut multo posteriores, quæ denique quotidie instituuntur: tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus Apostolicæ deputantur, pro consanguinitate doctrinæ.—Tertullian. *de præscript. adversus Hæret.* cap. xxxii. [Migne, ii. 45. Translated in note 17. p. 445.]

[20] Illis presbyteris obediendum est, qui cum episcopatus successione charisma acceperunt veritatis. [We must obey those priests who together with the episcopal succession received the grace of truth.] [This is a summary of the passage.]—S. Irenæus, [*adv. Hæres.*] lib. iv. cap. 43. [§§ 3, 4, 5. *Op.*, pp. 262, 263, ed. Benedict. et capp, 44, 45. pp. 344, 345. ed. Grabe. Migne, vii. 1054-5 (iv. 26. 3 and 4 and 5).]

[21] Successio, [de qua hic agitur,] nec locorum tantum est, nec personarum, sed etiam veræ atque sanæ doctrinæ [successio.] [The succession which we are here considering is neither of places only nor of persons only, but also of true and sound doctrine.]—Stapleton. *Relect. Controver.* [Controv. i. de Ecclesia in se,] [Quæst.] iv. A[rtic.] 2. Notabile 1. [*Op.*, tom. i. p. 563. B.]

[22] Quia doctrina sana est ab ipsa vera et legitima successione [prorsus] indivulsa; [ideoque data successione legitima, indubitate sequitur vera doctrina.] [Because sound doctrine comes by the true and lawful succession, continuously unbroken; and therefore given a lawful succession, without doubt the true doctrine follows.]—Stapleton. *ibid.*

wolf."[23] Now, then, let Stapleton take his choice. For either a pastor in this succession cannot become a wolf, and then this proposition is false; or else, if he can, then sound doctrine is not inseparable from true and legitimate succession, and then the former proposition is false:—as indeed it is; for that a good pastor may become a wolf, is no news in the ancient story of the Church, in which are registered the change of many great men into heretics,[24] (I spare their names;) and since Judas changed from an Apostle to a devil, it is no wonder to see others change from shepherds into wolves. I doubt the Church is not empty of such changelings at this day. Yea, but Stapleton will help all this; for he adds, "That suppose the pastors do forsake true doctrine, yet succession shall still be a true note of the Church; yet not every succession, but that which is legitimate and true." Well; and what is that? Why, "That succession is lawful, which is of those pastors which hold entire the unity and the faith."[25] Where you may see this Samson's hair cut off again; for at his word I will take him: and if that only be a legitimate succession, which holds the unity and the faith entire, then the succession of pastors in the Roman Church is illegitimate, for they have had more schisms amongst them than any other Church,[26]—therefore they have not kept the unity of the Church; and they have brought in gross superstition,—therefore they have not kept the faith entire. Now, if A. C. have any mind to it, he may do well

Section XXXIX.

John vi. 70.

[23] [Doctrina igitur fidei innotescit dupliciter. Subjecto populo, infirmis et turbis innotescit doctrina per doctorem et pastorem; nec judicandus ab illis, sed audiendus tantum, pastor est. At vero toti ecclesiæ ceu superiori suo innotescit verus pastor et doctor orthodoxus, non per personam quam gerit,] nam e pastore lupus fieri potest, [sed per doctrinam quam docet. The doctrine of faith is made known therefore in two ways. The doctrine is made known to the obedient people and to the ignorant crowds by means of the teacher and shepherd; nor is it their business to judge, but simply to listen to their shepherd. But to the whole Church, as to his superior, the true shepherd and orthodox teacher is made known not by the part which he plays, for a wolf can turn into a shepherd, but by the doctrine which he teaches.]—Stapleton. *ibid.* Notabile 4. [p. 563. D.]

[24] Vincent. Lirinens. *contra Hæres.* capp. xxiii. xxiv. [pp. 49—55. Origen and Tertullian are especially alluded to.]

[25] Est [autem] illorum pastorum legitima successio, qui [cum suis antecessoribus, a quibus ordinati sunt,] unitatem tenent; et a fide, [in qua ordinati sunt, postea] non recedunt. [Hæc duo faciunt successionem certam legitimam et indubitatam. The lawful succession belongs to those shepherds who keep in unity with their predecessors who ordained them, and do not after ordination retract from the faith in which they were ordained. These two things make a succession sure, lawful, and indisputable.]—Stapleton. *ibid.* Notabile 5. [p. 564. A.]

[26] In their own chronologer, Onuphrius, there are thirty acknowledged. [cf. Onuphrii Panvinii, Veronensis, Fasti, etc., appended to Platinæ, *Vit. Pontific.*]

[CHAPTER XV.]

to help Stapleton out of these briars, upon which he hath torn his credit, and I doubt his conscience too, to uphold the corruptions of the see of Rome.

IX. As for that in which he is quite mistaken, it is his inference, which is this: "That I should therefore consider carefully, whether it be not more Christian, and less brain-sick, to think that the pope, being St. Peter's successor, with a General Council, should be judge of controversies, etc. and that the pastoral judgment of him should be accounted infallible, rather than to make every man that can read the Scripture interpreter of Scripture, decider of controversies, controller of General Councils, and judge of his judges: or to have no judge at all of controversies of faith, but permit every man to believe as he list; as if there were no infallible certainty of faith to be expected on earth; which were, instead of one saving faith, to induce a Babylonical confusion of so many faiths as fancies, or no true Christian faith at all. From which evils, sweet Jesus, deliver us!" I have considered of this very carefully; but this inference supposes that which I never granted, nor any Protestant that I yet know—namely, that if I deny the pope to be judge of controversies, I must by and by either leave this supreme judicature in the hands and power of every private man, that can but read the Scripture, or else allow no judge at all, and so let in all manner of confusion. No, God forbid I should grant either: for I have expressly declared, "That the Scripture, interpreted by the Primitive Church, and a lawful and free General Council determining according to these, is judge of controversies: and that no private man whatsoever is or can be judge of these."[27] Therefore A. C. is quite mistaken—and I pray God it be not wilfully, to beguile poor Ladies, and other their weak adherents, with seeming to say somewhat—I say, quite mistaken, to infer that I am either for "a private judge," or for "no judge"; for I utterly disclaim both, and that as much if not more than he, or any Romanist, whoever he be. But these things in this passage I cannot swallow: First, "That the Pope with a General Council should be judge"; for the Pope in ancient Councils never had more power than any the other patriarchs: precedency, perhaps for order's sake and other respects, he had. Nor had the Pope any negative voice against the rest in point of difference. No, nor was he held superior to the Council[28]: there-

[27] Sect. xxvi. No. 1. [*vide supra*, p. 221.]

[28] Patrum et avorum nostrorum tempore, pauci audebant dicere, Papam

fore the ancient Church never accounted or admitted him a judge; no, not with a Council, much less without it. Secondly, it will not down with me that his "pastoral judgment" should be "infallible"; especially since some of them have been as ignorant as many that can but read the Scripture.[29] Thirdly, I cannot admit this neither—though he do most cunningly thereby abuse his readers—that anything hath been said by me, out of which it can justly be inferred, "That there is no infallible certainty of faith to be expected on earth"; for there is

esse supra Concilium. [In the time of our fathers and grandfathers, few dared to say that the Pope is above the Council.]—Æneas Sylvius, seu Pius II., *de Gestis Concil. Basil.* lib. i. —Et, Illudque in primis cupio notum, quia Romanum papam, omnes qui aliquo numero sunt, Concilio subjiciunt. [This especially I desire to have noted, that all, who are in any number, make the Roman Pope subject to the Council.]—*Ibid.* apud Fasciculum Rerum expetendarum fol. v. [F. ed. Colon. 1535.]—[Tertia] propositio: Summus pontifex [simpliciter et absolute] est supra ecclesiam universam, et supra concilium generale, [ita ut nullum in terris supra se judicium agnoscat.] Hæc [etiam] est *fere de fide*, [et probatur, etc.] [The third point is this: The supreme Pontiff is simply and absolutely above the whole Church, and above a General Council, and he admits no tribunal in the world above him. This is almost *de fide*, and is proved, etc.]—Bellarmin. *de Concil. auctoritat.* lib. ii. cap. 17. § 1. [*Op.*, tom. ii. col. 95. B.]

[29] [Sed] cum hoc tempore Romæ nullus [pene] sit, ut fama est, qui sacras (*caret* Baron.) literas didicerit, [sine quibus, ut scriptum est, vix ostiarius efficitur]: qua fronte aliquis docere audebit, quod minime didicit? [But at this time there is almost no one at Rome (so the report runs) who has learned the Bible, without which, as it is written, a man is scarcely ordained a doorkeeper; with what face will any one venture to teach what he has never learnt?]—Arnulph. [Episcop. Aurelian. seu forsan Gerberti, *contra Arnulph. Episcop. Rhemensem Oratio,*] *apud Concil. Rhemense*, [Baron. *Annal.* an. 992. No. xxv. Cf. *Concil.* tom. ix. coll. 737, 738. et *ibid.* notas Binii.]—Nam cum constet plures eorum adeo illiteratos esse, ut grammaticam penitus ignorent, qui fit ut sacras literas interpretari possint? [For since it is certain that the majority of them are so illiterate as to be certainly ignorant of grammar, how is it possible that they should interpret the sacred books?] —Alphons. a Castro, *advers. Hæres.* lib. i. cap. 4. versus medium, ed. Paris. 1534. For both that at Antwerp, an. 1556, and that at Paris, an. 1571, have been in purgatory. [Cf. p. 308. et *ibid.* note 7.]—And such an ignorant as these was Pope John XXIV. [Joannes capitur, et in carcerem conjicitur . . . Causam fugæ disquirere concilium tum cœpit, certosque judices viros gravissimos et doctissimos delegit, qui crimina Joanni objecta discuterent . . . Ad quadraginta capitula et eo amplius contra hominem probata sunt: quorum aliqua cum in eo minime immutari possent, adeo erant inveterata, contra fidem judicata sunt, aliqua vero Christianis omnibus, si non damnarentur, scandalum paritura . . . Joannes merito e pontificatu dejectus. John is captured, and cast into prison. The Council then began to enquire into the reason of his flight, and appointed some judges, men of weight and learning, to examine the accusations brought against John. . . . Up to forty heads and more were proved against him; some of them contained faults to which he was so habituated that he could not avoid them; these were decided to be contrary to the faith, and some of them were likely to bring scandal on all Christians, if they were not condemned in him. John was deservedly deposed from the Papal Throne.]—Platina *in vita ejus*, [p. 285.]—Et [*vide supra*,] Sect. xxxiii. Consid. vii. No. 7. [p. 307.]

[CHAPTER XV.] it and me; and a learned Protestant might have thought I had written it only to conceal myself and my judgment in those difficulties. But being written in the way it is, I believe no Romanist will have much cause to joy at it, or to think me a favourer of their cause. And since I am thus put to it, I will say thus much more. This book of mine is so written (by God's great blessing upon me) as that whensoever the Church of England (as they are growing towards it apace) shall depart from the grounds which I have therein laid, she shall never be able, before any learned and disengaged Christian, to make good her difference with, and her separation from, the Church of Rome. And let no man think I speak pride or vanity in this. For the outrages which have been against me force me to say it, and I am confident future times will make it good, unless profaneness break in and overrun the whole kingdom, which is not a little to be feared.]

A TABLE OF THE PLACES OF SCRIPTURE QUOTED IN THE CONFERENCE.

The principal passages in the Book in which the texts are used are marked in Clarendon type.

Genesis.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	16	233. 239
xv.	1	Dedication, xii

Deuteronomy.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
iv.	2	39
xiii.	1-3	124
xvii.	18	237
xxi.	19	184

Judges.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
v.	23	Dedication, xi
vi.	37	228
xvii.	6	Dedication, xi

1 Samuel.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
iii.	13	183, note 4
viii.	3. 5	183, note 4

1 Kings.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
xii.	27	168
xiii.	11	350
xvii.		349
xix.	18	169. 349

2 Kings.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
iii.		169, note 54. 349
ix.	6	169
xxiii.	2	174, note 78. 237

2 Chronicles.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
xxix.	4	174, note 78. 237

Psalms.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	1	254
i.	2	130, note 27
l.	19. 20	Dedication, vii
lviii.	4	438
lxxxv.	10	451
xc.	10	451
xciv.	10	121
cxviii.	12	Dedication, xi

Proverbs.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	8	299
vi.	20. 22	299 and 300
xv.	20	299

Isaiah.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	8	364, note 67
xliv.	2 *et passim.*	82
liii.	1	124

Jeremiah.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
ii.	13	392
v.	31	138, note 12
xx.	7 etc.	125
xxxviii.	17	125, note 11

Ezekiel.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
xiii.	10	356

Hosea.

iv.	15	169
ix.	17	169

Micah.

iv.	2	365, note 68

Malachi.

iii.	3	404, note 63

St. Matthew.

iv.	19	48
v.	16	Dedication, xv
ix.	12	68
x.	7	218, note 119
xi.	25	122
xii.	22	90
xiii.	25	151
xv.	14	Dedication, xiii
xvi.	18	15. 158. 187. 211 to 213. 266. 268. and notes, 279. 401
xvi.	19	55. 191. 214. 295, notes 105 and 106
xvi.	21	48
xviii.	7	152
xviii.	17	299. 336. 370
xviii.	18	214
xviii.	20	260, note 2. 266. 272, and notes.
xix.	14	66, note 5
xxii.	37	423
xxvi.	27	301. 302
xxviii.	19. 20	107. 109
xxviii.	19	218, note 119
xxviii.	20	187. 266. 268, notes 26 and 27.

St. Mark.

x.	14	66, note 5. 69
xiii.	22	124
xvi.	17	90

St. Luke.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	30	78
ix.	23	126
x.	16	107. 108
xii.	48	422. and note 113
xvi.	8	105
xviii.	16	66, note 5
xxii.	32	55. 188. 191. 215. 266. 271
xxiv.	47	365. note 68

St. John.

iii.	5	65, and note 5
iv.	42	114
v.	31	103, note 26
v.	47	139
vi.	45	129, note 24
vi.	70	447
ix.	29	139
x.	4	115
x.	41	124
xi.	42	217
xii.	8	267, note 22
xii.	48	372
xiii.	13	112
xiv.	16	107. 110. 189. 266
xiv.	26	266
xvi.	12	72, note 21
xvi.	13	186. 189. 266
xvi.	14	266
xvii.	3	129
xix.	35	122, note 6
xx.	23	214
xxi.	15	55. 218
xxi.	25	72, note 21

Acts.

i.	3	79
ii.	38. 39	67 and notes.
iv.	12	423
v.	3	212, note 95
vi.	2	225, note 6
vi.	9	145
ix.	29	145
xi.	26	365, note 68
xv.	6	225, note 6. 303

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
xv.	28	266. 275. and notes, 303
xvi.	15	66, note 5
xvii.	32	125
xix.	17	145
xxviii.	25	82

Romans.

i.	8	8. 154. note 19. 396
i.	20	71. 127, note 15
iii.	4	417
iii.	8	Dedication, x
v.	15. 18	40
viii.	18	Dedication, xii
x.	10	438
x.	14. 15	415
xi.	16	159
xii.	1	359, note 51
xiii.	1	235
xiv.	4	368, 393

1 Corinthians.

i.	10	421
ii.	11	372
ii.	14	86, note 61. 98, note 11
iii.	2	218, note 120
iii.	11	268
iii.	12	372
iii.	15	406. 408, notes 77 and 78. 411, note 85
v.	5	299
ix.	16	Dedication, xi
x.	15	4
xi.	1	109, note 35
xi.	19	228. 244. 421
xi.	23	301. 302
xii.	3. 4	83, note 52
xii.	10	124, note 9. 291
xii.	28	442, note 11
xiii.	12	161, note 20

Galatians.

i.	8	86. 131
iii.	19	78, and note 37
iv.	6	28
v.	19-21	351

Ephesians.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	23	167
ii.	20	268
iv.	5	393
iv.	11	441, and note 11
iv.	13	442
v.	2	357, note 47
v.	27	300. 398, note 47

Philippians.

ii.	21	Dedication, xvi

Colossians.

iii.	21	183

2 Thessalonians.

ii.	9	124
ii.	15	72, note 21. 82

1 Timothy.

iii.	15	41. 288, note 83
vi.	20	79
vi.	16	127

2 Timothy.

i.	14	79

Hebrews.

v.	12	218, note 120
ix.	12	357, note 47
x.	10	357, note 47
xi.	1	121
xi.	6	50. 423
xi.	37	363
xii.	9	183
xiii.	15	359, note 50
xiii.	17	299

St. James.

i.	20	172
ii.	1	381, note 5

1 St. Peter.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	11	84, note 54
iii.	15	294, and Dedication, xvii
v.	3	105

2 St. Peter.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
i.	16	129
i.	19	139

1 St. John.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
ii.	19	369, note 2
iv.	2	50

St. Jude.

	3	82. 390
	3	Dedication, xvi

Revelation.

CH.	VERSE	PAGE
xii.	1	239
xxii.	12	Dedication, xii

INDEX.

Clarendon type refers to the page in the Book where details on the person or subject are given.

A

A. C., **5**, note 4.
Africans, their opposition to the Roman Church, and separation from it, 197, etc.; they are cursed and damned for it by Eulalius, and this accepted by the Pope, 197; St. Augustine involved in that curse, 198.
Alexandria, Church of, 202.
Albertus Magnus, **50**.
Alliaco, Peter de, 149, note 10, **225**, note 6.
Almain, Jac., against the Pope's infallibility, 307; his tenet touching the belief of Scripture and the Church, 97.
Alphonsus a Castro's confession touching the Pope's infallibility, 307; his moderation touching heresy, 29; his late editions shrewdly purged, 308.
Ambrose, St., **38**, 310; on Purgatory, 405.
Anselm, St., Archbishop of Canterbury, how esteemed of by Pope Urban the Second, **196**.
Anabaptists, 166.
Apocrypha, 19, note 46; some books received by the Trent Fathers which are not accepted by Sextus Senensis, 390.
Apostles stand alone, 94-95, etc., 122.
Appeals to foreign Churches, 194; no appeal from Patriarchs or Metropolitans, 195.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, **53**.
Arians, 152, note 14, 248; the large increase of them, 354, note 41; wherein they dissented from the orthodox Christians, 361.
Aristotle falsely said to hold the mortality of the soul, 128, notes 22 and 23.
Assistance, what promised by Christ to His Church, what not, 107, 187, 266, etc.; what given to His Church and Pastors thereof, 109, 113, 276, 278, 294, 417.
Assurance infallible even by human proof, 140.
Athanasius, St., 254, 310, 396, etc.
Athanasian Creed, 377, 396, etc.
Augustine, St., **32**, 39, 52, 68, 94, 96, 142, 192, 215, etc.; righted, 155, 166, 279 to 284, 334, 410, 430, 440; his proofs of Scripture, 114; on Purgatory, 410; on the keys, 215, 295; on heretical Baptism, 350.
Author, The, his small time to prepare for this conference, 26; his submission to the Church of England and the Church Catholic, 264; the rule of his faith, 439, 440; pride imputed to him, and retorted upon the imputers, 440.

Azorius on Roman Catholics worshipping with heretics, 437, note 1.

B

Baptism, of anointing, and three dippings in it, 80; that of infants, 40, note 29; how proved out of Scripture, 64, 65, note 5; acknowledged by some Romanists that it may be proved thence, 67; the necessity of it, 65; how proved by tradition, and St. Augustine's mind thereon, 69; that by heretics, schismatics, and sinners, not theirs but Christ's, 351.

Basil, St., 36; explained, 105, note 29; on Purgatory, 406.

Baronius, 17.

Beatitude supreme, how to be attained, 129, note 24.

Belief of some things necessary before they be known, 91. *See* Faith.

Bellarmine, 6, 11, 53, 238; his dissent from Stapleton, 47; and from Catharinus, 58, 403; his tenet touching belief of Scripture confuted, 101, note 21; his proofs of Roman infallibility, 6, etc.; on Scripture, 77.

Berengarius, his gross recantation, 383, note 8.

Bernard, St., righted, 154, 155, 271.

Biel, his true assertion touching things that be *de fide*, 450, note 30.

Bishops, their calling and authority over the inferior clergy, 200, note 57; their places and precedences ordered, 201; the titles given them of old, 193; all of the same merit and degree, 229, note 15, 231, 232, note 30.

Bodies representing and represented, their power, privileges, etc., compared together, 264, 303.

Bramhall, Archbishop, 329.

Brierly, John, 102.

Britain of old not subject to the See of Rome, 195; Gildas's testimony concerning the antiquity of the conversion of it, 365, note 68.

Buckingham, Duke of, Introduction, 118, 451.

Buckingham, Countess of, Introduction, 4, 144, 331, etc., 379, 434, 451.

Buonaventura, 56.

C

Calvin and Calvinists for the real presence, 344, 348; on Baptism of Infants, 69.

Cajetan, Cardinal, 314, 395.

Campanella, his late Eclogue, 241.

Campian, his boldness, 165.

Canterbury, the ancient place and power of the Archbishops thereof, 196, note 41.

Capellus, his censure of Baronius, 171.

Carthage, first Council of, 11.

Cathari, 166.

Catharinus, Bishop Ambrosius, 36, 58, 318, 360.

Certainty. *See* Faith.

Certainty of salvation. *See* Salvation.

Charlemagne, 237.

Chillingworth, 328.

Christ's descent into hell. *See* Descent.

Chrysologus, 271.

Chrysostom, St. John, 139, 202.

Church, The, its office to guide men to Scripture, chap. iv.; special endowments of the Apostles, 95, note 2, 122; wherein it differeth from a General Council, 34; no particular one infallible, 5, 104, 105, etc.; not that of Rome, 6, 10, etc., 19; Catholic Church, which is it, 364; her declarations, what fundamental, what not, 38; how far they bind, 38; her authority not divine, 41; not in those things wherein she cannot err, 76; wherein she cannot universally err, 157, note 25, 159, 185; she in the

commonwealth, not the commonwealth in her, 231, etc.; how she must be always visible, 372; of her root, 426, etc.; what the opinion of the ancients concerning it, 425, etc., 428; a Church, and the Church, how they differ, 145, etc.; by what assistance of the Spirit the Church can be made infallible, 104; the authority of the primitive compared with that of the present Church, 94.

Church of Cæsarea, her title given by St. Gregory Nazianzen, 429.

Church, Greek. *See* Greek.

Church of England, a part of the Catholic, 364, etc.; where her doctrine is set down, 58, 62; freedom of, 59; her motherly dealing with her children, *ib.*; her articles and canons maintained, 59; of her positive and negative articles, 62, 63; her synod of 1562, 176; her purity, 438; how safe to communicate with her, 435; what judges and rulers in things spiritual she hath and acknowledgeth, 242; how she is wronged by the Roman, 365, etc.; Salvation more certain in her than in the Roman, 379, etc.; how one particular Church may judge another, 194, etc.; mutual criminations of the eastern and western, 202, etc.

Church, A, in Israel after her separation from Judah, 169.

Church of Rome. *See* Rome.

Communion. *See* Eucharist.

Concomitancy in the Eucharist. *See* Eucharist.

Conference, the occasion of this, 3; the Jesuit's manner of dealing in this and in the former, 377.

Cornelius, Pope, 7.

Councils, chapter ix., 258-284, etc., 401; the infallibility they have is not exact, but congruous infallibility, 295; whence and where it is principally resident, 295, 303, etc.; how inferiors may judge of their decrees, 287; a General Council the only fit judge of the present controversies, 243, etc.; and how that to be qualified, 172, 253; the Bishop of Rome not always president in General Councils, 245, note 71; what impediments have been and now are of calling and continuing them, 224 and notes; what of them lawful, what not, 247, etc.; what obedience to be yielded to them erring, 260, 299; the words "Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis" not used by any posterior Council, 276; the first and later Councils differently assisted, 277, 294, etc.; whence they have their power and assistance, 264, etc.; the prior may be amended by the posterior, 283, etc.; in what way they are held by the Romanists to be infallible, 289; their decrees by Stapleton held to be the oracles of the Holy Ghost, 276, etc.; that they are not prophetical in their conclusions, 290, etc.; that they may err, 417, the whole Church not erring, chap. x.; how made of no worth at all by the Romanists without the Pope, 305, etc.

Councils and Fathers, how we are sure we have their true copies, 385-388.

Council of Constance, its injurious proceedings against Huss, etc., 161-164; its great error touching Communion in one kind, 301-320.

Council of Nice, the absence of the western Bishops from it, how recompensed, 251; Pope's Legates at, 245, note 71.

Council of Africa in St. Cyprian's time erred about Baptism by heretics, 282.

Council of Trent. *See* Trent.

Cranmer on Eucharist, 347, 348, note 32.

Creed, that it is a rule of faith, 49; that it is wholly grounded on Scripture, 51; some words added to it, why, and by whom, 16; Irenæus's famous testimony to it, 389, note 18.
Creed, Athanasian. *See* Athanasian.
Cyprian, St., 7; cleared, 6, etc.; and righted, 424, etc.; on Baptism, 40, 370; on Bishops, 232; his authority, 279, note 50; on Purgatory, 404.
Cyril, St., of Alexandria, 18; vindicated, 14.

D

Damascene, John, St., 28, note 62.
Demonstrative reasons of greater force than any other human proof, 285, etc.; direct proof and demonstrative, how they differ, 64.
Descent of Christ into hell, how held by the Church of England, and how by those of Rome, 51-54, 356, 381.
Dissent and difference of opinion, what may stand with the peace of the Church, 421.
Disputations, their use, 145; when and how lawful for a private man to dispute with the whole Church, 156; public disputations, how safe or available, 165; in what case to be admitted between the English and the Romish clergy, 165.
Divinity, that it hath a science above it, and what, 137; the principles of it otherwise confirmed than those of any other art, 120, 126, 127.
Donatus, 352.
Donatists compared with the Romanists, 352, and note 38, 166; whether any of them living and dying so had possibility of salvation, and how, 353; whether they were guilty of heresy, 352, note 38.
Duns Scotus, 36.
Durandus, 53.

E

Ebionites, 363, note 62.
English Church. *See* Church of England.
Emperor, whom the Jesuits would have to be, 240, etc. *See* Pope.
Epiphanius, 211; cleared and vindicated, 212, etc.
Errors of Councils. *See* Councils.
Errors of the Roman Church, 355, etc., 439, 443, etc.
Errors of Papists, to whom fundamental, 371, etc. *See* Church of Rome.
Eucharist, a threefold sacrifice in it, 357; mutilated by the Roman Church, 22, 301, 321, 356, 358, note 49, 382, 394; upon what hard terms the Bohemians were dispensed with, to have it in both kinds, 356; the Papists tied by their own grounds to believe of it as the Church of England doth, 338, etc.; the Church of England and other Protestants believe Christ's real presence in it, 338, etc., 347, note 32; concomitancy in it, Thomas of Acquin's fiction confuted, 357; Bellarmine's notorious contradiction of Christ's being in it corporally present, 347, note 32; his new and intricate doctrine touching transubstantiation, 382, note 7; of the unbloody sacrifice and the bloody, how they differ, 358, note 49; propitiatory and gratulatory sacrifice, how they differ, 359, note 50.

F

Faith, divine, 36; so called Roman, 13; what is certain by the certainty of it, 47; not to be termed the Roman, but the Christian or Catholic faith, 154; the two regular precepts of it, 49; of its prime principles, and how they differ from the articles of it, 50; the last resolution of it, into what it should be, 114, 384, 385, 397; infused faith, 416, note 100; how few

things are essential to the faith, 422, etc.; how its principles differ from those of sciences, 120; its foundation the Scripture, 62; by it man brought to his last happiness, 121, etc.; that it is an act produced by the will, 121; the principles of it have sufficient evidence of proof, 135, etc.; it and reason compared in their objects, etc., 292, etc.; a latitude in it in reference to different men's salvation, 380, 422; things of two sorts belonging to it, 44; what by it to be believed explicitly, what not, 389, etc.; of the perfection and certainty of it, 450, note 30; of things not necessary to salvation, no infallible faith can be among men, 418; foundation of faith, how shaken, 46; the Catholic and the now Roman faith not both one, 396; faith of Scripture to be God's word infused by the Holy Ghost, 84, 85; the true grounds of it, 126, etc.; our faith of it, how it differs from that of those who wrote the Scripture, 124, etc.; faith of Scripture, that it hath all perfections necessary, 131, etc.; how firm and invincible it is, 130, etc.

Felicity, what it is, and that the soul of man is capable of it, 128.

Ferus, 67; his acknowledgment of the difference betwixt the first Councils and the late ones, 277, note 48.

Fisher, 5, note 4, and Introduction.

Florence, Council of, 170, 402, 403, notes.

Florinus, 18.

France, power of king of, 241.

Frith, on Eucharist, 346.

Fundamentals, chap. ii.

G

Gerson, his ingenuity, 172.

Ghost, Holy, how said to be lost, 25; His procession from the Son added to the Creed by the Roman Church, 29, 170; the Greek Church, her error touching this, 25; what and how dangerous, 27; His witness to Scripture, 83, 93.

Gildas, 365, note 68.

God, proof of the true one by testimony of the false ones, 89.

Goldwell, Bishop, 177, 246, note 73.

Government of the Church, in what sense monarchical, in what aristocratical, 229, etc.

Gregory, St., the Great, 110; on Purgatory, 411, 412, note 87.

Gregory Nazianzen, St., 14; on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 28, note 62; his humility and mildness, 193, note 30; on Western Bishops, 202, note 66; on Purgatory, 406.

Gregory, St., of Nyssa, on Purgatory, 408.

Gregory VII., Pope, the raiser of the Papacy to the height, 237, 238; his twenty-seven conclusions the basis of the Papal greatness, 207, note 84.

Greek Church, notwithstanding her error, still a true Church, 29; and justified by some Romanists, *ib.*; her hard usage by the Church of Rome, 30; of her Bishops, their subscription to the Council of Florence, 402, note 54; friendship with England, 31.

H

Harding, Thomas, 308.

Henry a Gand, 78, note 40.

Heresies, what makes them, 37; the occasion of their first springing up, 224, note 5; how and by whom begun at Rome, 17, etc.; a number of, 363.

Heretics, none to be rashly condemned for such, 29; that some may pertain to the Church, 370, note 4; who they are who teach that faith given to heretics is not to be kept, 161, etc.

Hierome, St., **11**, 154, note 19; in what esteem he had Bishops, **200**.
Hilary, St., of Poitiers, on Purgatory, 407.
Hooker righted, 102, etc., 285, etc.

I

Idolaters, their gods, how put down by Christian religion, 89; idolatry, how maintained in the Church of Rome, and with what evil consequences, 323, etc., 351.
Images, how worshipped by the Church of Rome, 22; against adoration of them, 323, 382; Cassander's complaint of it, 325; the flying from image worship should not make us to run into profaneness and irreverence against God, 327.
Infallible, two acceptations of it, 141; infallible and firm, how they differ, 222; the evils ensuing the opinion of the Church's and the Pope's infallibility, 251, 306, etc.; what an infallibility of the Church Stapleton is forced to acknowledge, 294, etc.; claims to infallibility, 107. *See* Councils, Pope, Church.
Innocent III., his extolling the Pope above the Emperor, 233, etc.
Intention, doctrine of, **317**, **328**, **329**, 360, 382.
Invocation of Saints, against, 322.
Irenæus, St., **18**, 34, 156; vindicated, 207, etc., 443, etc.; on succession of Bishops, **444**, **note 16**.
Isidorian decretals, 20, note 50.
Israel, a Church after her separation from Judah, 169, etc.

J

James, St., believed to have been successor of our Lord in the principality of the Church, **214**, note 102.
James I., on the Greek Church, 25.
Jeremias, the Greek patriarch, of, his censure, 252.
Jerome. *See* Hierome.
Jesuits, their manner of dealing in this Conference, 376, 377; their cunning in expounding the Fathers to their own purpose, 12; their confidence, 26; their arrogancy, 113; their subtle malignity, 436, 448; their attributing to themselves infallibility, 108; their desire of having one king as one pope, 233, etc.; their late cunning argument to draw Protestants to them answered, 349, etc; their falsification of the author's words, 151.
Jesuitism, a perfect, 148.
Jewell, Bishop, 301, note 121, 445; opinion on Council of Trent, **256**, etc.
Jews, the ground of their belief of the Old Testament, 139.
Judge, who to be in controversies, touching faith and manners, 182, etc., 191, etc., 448; what judges of this kind the church hath, 221, etc., 448; who to judge when a General Council cannot be had, 225; that no visible judge can prevent or remedy all heresy or schism, 228; a visible living judge of all controversies, whether always necessary, 224, etc.; wherein private men may judge, and wherein not, 4, 263, etc., 285.

K

Keys, the, to whom given, and how, 214, 295.
Kingdom, is the church a, 228, etc., 232.
Kings, *custodes utriusque tabulæ*, 236; not to be tyrannized over by the Pope, 218, 231, 254, etc.; their supremacy in things spiritual, 174, 194, 236, notes 39 and 40; some Romanists for the deposing and killing of them, 394, note 36; rights of, 242, 254.
Knowledge of God, how difficult, 126, tc.; what knowledge needful to breed faith, 100, etc.; what

degree of it is necessary to salvation, hard to determine, 380, 422; the Apostles' knowledge, how different from that of their hearers, 122, note 6.

L

Lactantius, St., on Purgatory, 407.
Laud. *See* Author.
Light from Scripture, 81, 100.
Limbus Patrum, against, 356, 381.
Literæ communicatoriæ, what they were and of what use, 230.
Lombard, Peter, 28, note 62, 36; condemned of heresy by the Pope, 311.
Lord Keeper Williams, 5, Introduction.
Ludovisi, Papal family of the, 118.

M

Maldonate answered, 260, note 2.
Manichees, 42, note 32; their foul heresy, and what stumbled them, 91.
Manners, corruptions in them, no sufficient cause of separation, 165, etc.
Martyrs, of the feasts made of old at the oratories, 325.
Mass, the English liturgy better and safer than it, 360; what manner of sacrifice it is made by them of Rome, 359.
Matrix and *radix* in St. Cyprian not the Roman Church, 424, etc.
Merits, against their condignity, 335.
Miracles, what proofs of Divine truth, 86, 123; not wrought by all the writers of Scripture, 124; what kind of assent is commonly given to them, 124.
Misprinting the Bible, 106.
Mohammedan view of Christianity, 383, note 8.

N

National Churches, 155, 168, etc., 173, etc., 176, etc., 190, 364.
Nestorius, 43.
Novatians, their original, 17, etc., 202, note 62, 425, etc.
Novatian, how dealt with by St. Cyprian, 7, 425, etc.
Novatus, 17.

O

Occham, 35; his true resolution touching that which maketh an article of faith, 450, note 30.
Optatus, St., 201, 231.
Origen, his errors obtruded by Ruffinus, 12, 13; he the first founder of doctrine of Purgatory, 404, 413.

P

Pamelius, 17.
Papists, their denying possibility of salvation to Protestants confuted, and their reasons answered, 331, etc.; of their going to Protestant Churches and joining themselves to their assemblies, 437, note 1.
Parents, their power over their children, 183.
Parliament, 228; what matters they treat of and decree, 242, 243, 254.
Pastors lawfully sent, what assistance promised to them, 108, etc.; their embassy, of what authority, 112.
Patriarchs, all alike supreme, 194-204, 230.
Perfidia, the different significations of it, 7-10.
Perron, Cardinal, 210.
Petavius, 17.
Peter, St., of Christ's prayer for him, 188, 215; of his primacy, preeminency and power, 211, etc., 268, note 28, on "The Rock"; in what sense the Church is said to be built upon him, 213; that he fell, but not from the faith, 215; whether he were universal pastor, 218; the highest power ecclesiastical, how given to him, and how to the rest of the Apostles, 191.

Peter Lombard, 28, 36, 311.
Pole, Cardinal, 246.
Pope, not infallible, 6, 20, 21, 104, 105, 151, note 11, 186, 210, 248, and chapter xi.; how improbable and absurd it is to say he is so, 316, etc.; made more infallible by Romanists, than a General Council, 305, 391; his infallibility held by some against conscience, 312; if he had any it were useless, 316; how opposed by Alphonsus a Castro, 307, 308, note 7; the belief and knowledge of it, both of them impossible, 318; his claim in Middle Ages, 21, note 51; that he may err as Pope, 305, etc., 309, note 9; not Monarch of the Church, 229; he hath not a negative voice in Councils, 448; made by some as infallible without as with a General Council, 306; his confirmation of General Councils, of what avail, 319; of his power in France and Spain, 231; how much greater he is made by some than the Emperor, 233, etc., 241; his power slighted by some great princes, 231; whether he may be a heretic, and being one, how to be dealt with, 314, etc.; all his power, prerogatives, etc., indirectly denied by Stapleton, 55.
Popes, witness to themselves, 20, 21; wickedness of some of them, 166, 449, note 29; of their power and principality, 191, etc., 448; their subjection to the Emperor, 200; and how lost by the Emperor, 205; and how recovered, 206; presidency of councils, 245, note 71; primacy of order granted them by Ecclesiastical Constitutions, but no principality of power from Christ, 191; some of them opposed by the African Church, 197; some of them heretics, 217; some apostates, 310; some false prophets, 311; the lewd lives of many of them, 307.
Pope Liberius, his clear testimony against the Pope's infallibility, 310.
Præstigiæ, 11, etc.
Prayer, what requisite that it may be heard, 272-275; prayer for the dead, that it presupposeth not purgatory, 403.
Preachers, how their preaching to be esteemed of, 112, etc.; none since the Apostles infallible, 415.
Precisians, their opposition to lawful ceremonies occasioned by the Romanists, 327; that there be of them in the Roman Church no less than in the Protestant, 153; their agreement in many things, 113.
Princes, the moderation and equity of all that are good, 183; the power of sovereign princes in matters ecclesiastical, 194; all of the clergy subject to them, 236.
Principles presupposed, 120, 134.
Private judgment, 4.
Private spirit, 227.
Prophecy, the spirit of, not to be attained by study, 290.
Protestants, why so called, 153, 154; of their departing from the errors of the Roman Church, 150, 152; on what terms invited by Rome to a General Council, 161, etc.; their charitable grant of possibility of salvation in the Roman Church, met with uncharitableness by the Roman party, 332, 337; they that deny possibility of salvation to them confuted, 336; their faith sufficient to salvation, 380, note 5.
Purgatory, 381; scarce thought of by any Father within the three first hundred years, 403, etc.; not presupposed by prayer for the dead, 403; Origen, the first founder of the doctrine, 404; proofs of it examined, 405; the purgatories mentioned by the Fathers different from that believed by Rome, 404, etc.; the Fathers alleged for it cleared, 403, etc.;

the Papists, their assertion touching the necessity of believing it, 414.

R

Reason, 2; not excluded or blemished by grace, 86; the chief use of it, 90; what place it has in the proof of divine supernatural truths, 71, 87; how high it can go in proving the truth of Christian religion, 88, 126, 128, notes 22 and 23, 293.

Reformation, that it is necessary, 149, note 10; in what case it is lawful for a particular Church to reform herself, 168, etc.; examples of it, 173, etc.; faults incident to reformation and reformers of religion, 175; who the chief hinderers of a general reformation, 176; reformation of the Church of England justified, 199; what place princes have in the reformation of the Church, 174.

Religion, Christian, how the truth of it proved by the ancients, 88; the propagation of it, and the firmness where it is once received, 90; the evil of believing it in one sort and practising it in another, 436; yet this taught by some Jesuits and Romish priests, 437; one Christian religion of both Protestants and Romanists, though they differ in it, 438; private men's opinions in religion not to be esteemed the Church's, 54; religion as it is professed in the Church of England, nearest, of any Church now being, to the primitive Church, 438.

Representation of the Church, 34, 264.

Resurrection, what believed by all Christians, what by some heretics denied, 362.

Revelation, divine, the necessity of it, 129.

Rhenanus, B., purged on behalf of Rome, 328, note 125.

Ridley, Bishop, his full confession of the Real Presence, 348; his correction of Archbishop Cranmer's judgment touching it, 348.

Rogers, Mr., 51, 54, 56, note 76.

Rome, Church of, a true Church, 145; but corrupt, 149; her infallibility supposed to be proved by Fathers, 6 to 20; not *the* True Church, chap. vii.; Rome, her praeter and superstructures in the faith, 13; a particular church, 149; she and Spain compared in their two monarchies, 240; heresies both begun and maintained in her, 17; wherein she hath erred, 22; whether impossible for the Apostolic See to be removed thence, 23; that she may apostatise, 24; her definitions of things not necessary, 39; her severity in cursing all other Christians, 59; how far she extends the authority of her testimony, 73, etc.; she the chief hindrance of a general reformation, 176; of her pretended sovereignty, and the bad effects of it, 182, etc.; what principality and power she hath, and whence, 191, 200, 208; she not the head of the Church, nor did all Churches depend on her, 194, 197, 423, etc.; whether all Christians be bound to agree with her in faith, 208; and in what case they are so, 210, etc.; the ancient bounds of her jurisdiction, 209; possibility of salvation in her, and to whom, 332, and notes 2 and 3, 351, 368, etc.; the danger of living and dying in her communion, 336, 337, 349, 351, 353, 355; her rigour and cruelty beyond that of schismatical Israel, 349; the Catholic Church her head and root, not she of it, 430; state of Roman Church in 1622, 117; how she, and how other Churches, Apostolic, 431; how corrupted in doctrine and manners, 165, etc.; she not the Catholic Church, 336, 430; false titles given her, 423; her belief,

how different from that of the ancient Church, 381, etc.; other Churches as well as she called *Matres et Originales Ecclesiæ*, 424, note 119; a church at Jerusalem, Antioch, and probably in England, before one at Rome, 365, note 68; Cardinal Perron, his absurd tenet that the Roman Church is the Catholic causally, 367, note 70. *See* Errors, Pope.

Roman See, in what case a particular Church may make canons without consulting it, 171, 173; looked upon as anti-Christ, 144.

Ruffinus, 11, 12, 15, 389; his dissent from the Roman Church, 19; branded by the Pope with heresy, 20; his words explained, 15, 17, 20.

S

Sacraments, against the necessity of his intention who administers them, 317, etc., 328, 329, 360, 382.

Sacrilege and schism usually go together, 176, note 81.

Saints, against the invocation of them, 322, etc.; they are made by Bellarmine, to be *numina*, and in some sort our redeemers, 323, note 45.

Salmeron, 67.

Salvation, controversies amongst the Romanists about the certainty of it, 57.

Say, Laud's Answer to Lord, 254.

Schism, the heinousness of it, 167; who the cause of it at this day, 152, 154, 219; the continuance of it, whence, 164.

Schismatical Church, to live in one and to communicate in the schism, how different, 349; the Protestants, their leaving Rome no schism, 219; of the schism of Israel, and those that lived there in the time of it, 169, 349.

Science, The supreme, 137, etc.

Scripture, canon of, 19, 82, 90; importance of, 61, etc.; Church of England's use of, chaps. iii., iv.; the foundation of Faith, 63, 114; how known to be Scripture, 70, 75, etc.; church inferior to, 73, note 25, 96; known by its own light, 81, 98, 100; dictated by the Holy Ghost, 84, 104; relied upon by the Ancient Fathers, 88; witness of the Holy Spirit within us, 93; Bellarmine on, 101, note 21; correctly printed, 106; proof that it is the word of God, chap. v., 140; accepted by Faith, 131; authority of to be assumed in debates among Christians, chap. vi., 138, note 12; what the chief and what the first inducement to the credibility of it, 97, etc., 103, 114, 122, etc.; Scripture and tradition confirm each other mutually, not equally, 112; the way of the Ancient Church in proving Scripture to be God's word, 114; four proofs brought for it, *ib.*; the seeming contradiction of Fathers touching Scripture and tradition, reconciled, 116, 117; belief of Scripture, the true grounds of it, 126, etc., 129, etc.; rules of finding true sense of it, 74, etc.; historical evidence, 122; the writers of it, what certainty we have who they were, 122; that it is a rule sufficient and infallible, 222, note 3, 226 and note 10, 227; its prerogative above General Councils, 280-287; what assurance that we have the true sense of Scriptures, Councils, Fathers, etc., 385-388; some books of Scripture anciently doubted of, and some not canonical received by some into the canon, 82; the Judge, 222 and note 3.

Separation: for what one church may lawfully separate from another, 158, 165, etc.; corruption in manners no sufficient cause of separation, 166; what separation necessary, 152, 452.

Sermons exalted to too great a height both by Jesuits and Precisians, 112, 113, etc.; their true worth and use, 113.
Simancas, his shameful tenet concerning faith given to heretics, 162, note 34.
Sixtus Senensis, on the *Index Expurgatorius*, 387, note 14; his doubting of some of the apocryphal books received by the Council of Trent, 390.
Socinianism, the monster of heresies, 362.
Socinus, 363.
Sorbonists, 391.
Soto, Dominic, 57.
Spalato, Archbishop of, made to speak for Rome, 414.
Spain, King of, claims of, 240, 241.
Spirit, Of the private, 83, 285.
Stapleton, 52, 166, 276, 289, 301, 306, 366, 382; his inconsistency concerning the succession, 446, etc.
Stephen, Pope, upbraided by Cyprian, 10.
Stillingfleet, 59, 95, note 2; on the Synod of 1562, 176.
Suarez, 339.
Suburbicarian Churches, 209.
Succession what, a note of the church, 441, etc.; not to be found in Rome, 447.
Synesius, 9.

T

Tertullian, 145, 389; on Purgatory, 404; on Apostolic churches, 432, note 132; on succession, 445.
Theodoret, 408.
Theophylact, 216, 271.
Theophilus of Alexandria, his worth, and his violent spirit, 202.
Traditions, what to be approved, 51, 63; tradition and Scripture proofs of the same things, 69; it not a sufficient proof of Scripture, 72, etc.; it and God's unwritten word, not terms convertible, 80; tradition of the present church, what uses it has, 94, etc., 103, 142; how it differs from the tradition of the primitive church, 96, 111; traditions of the church mere human authority, 104; what tradition the Fathers meant by saying we have the Scriptures by tradition, 116, etc.; tradition apostolical, the necessity and use of it, *ib.*; tradition, how known before Scripture, 136; what most likely to be a tradition apostolical, 69, etc.; the danger of leaning too much upon tradition, 138, note 12.
Transubstantiation, against, 321, 339, 394, 395, notes 37 and 38, 347; Suarez, his plain confession, that it is not of necessary belief, 339; Cajetan and Alphonsus a Castro, their opinion concerning it, 395, notes 37, 38; scandal taken by Averroes at the doctrine of it, 382, 383, notes 7 and 8. *See* Eucharist.
Trent, Council of, 48, 161, 172, 244, 250, 256, 317, 396.
Turrecremata, John de, 314.

U

Union of Christendom, how little regarded, and how hindered by Rome, 359, 380.
Unity, the causes of the breaches thereof, 421, etc.; not that unity in the faith amongst the Romanists which they so much boast of, 390, etc.
Universal Bishop, a title condemned by St. Gregory, yet usurped by his successors, 203, etc., note 70.
Ussher, Archbishop, 403.

V

Vega, Andreas, 57.
Victor, Pope, taxed by Irenæus, 156, 207.

Vincentius Lirinensis, 48, etc., 114, 443.
Visible Church, 5, 372, etc.
Vives, on Image Worship, 325.

W

White, Bishop, 4, 5, 82, note 49, 371, etc.
Word of God, that it may be written and unwritten, 77; why written, 78; uttered mediately or immediately, 78; many of God's unwritten words not delivered to the Church, 80, etc. *See* Scripture and Tradition.
Worth of men, of what weight in proving truth, 354, etc.

GLASGOW: PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO.

ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

General Editor

THE REV. FREDERIC RELTON,

Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington.

IT is intended, under the general title of the English Theological Library, to issue, either complete editions or selected portions of, the writings of the principal English Theologians of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, with Introductions and Notes, so as to be of real service to students, and especially to those preparing for University or Ordination Examinations.

The publishers feel that there is a great gap in editions of this kind, both with reference to single important works, and to a general systematic presentation of the course of English religious history and life. They propose to classify the volumes under the headings of Dogmatic, Historical, Homiletical, and Exegetical, and to make each section as complete as possible.

The volumes will vary in the number of pages and price, but will otherwise be uniform in size, *i.e.* Demy 8vo, and in type.

The co-operation of the best scholarship of the day is being sought and willingly rendered. An idea of the scheme will be best gained by a perusal of a list of some of the works proposed.

The following Works are in preparation:—

WILLIAM LAW'S *Serious Call.* Edited by the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, D.D., Canon of Lincoln, and Rector of Gumley. 8s. 6d. net. [*Ready.*

BISHOP WILSON'S *Maxims of Piety and Christianity.* Edited by the Rev. FREDERIC RELTON, A.K.C., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington. 5s. 6d. net. [*Ready.*

HOOKER'S *Ecclesiastical Polity.* Book V. Edited by the Rev. RONALD BAYNE, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Blackheath, and late Heron Exhibitioner of University College, Oxford. [*Shortly.*

BUTLER'S *Analogy* and *Sermons.* 2 vols. Edited by the Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

Vol. I. *Sermons*, etc. [*Ready.*
Vol. II. *The Analogy.* [*Ready.*

JEWEL'S *Apology.* Edited by the Rev. G. A. SCHNEIDER, M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

LAUD'S *Controversy with Fisher.* Edited by the Rev. C. H. SIMPKINSON, M.A., Rector of Stoke-upon-Trent, Author of the *Life and Times of Archbishop Laud.* [*Ready.*

WHICHCOTE'S *Aphorisms.* Edited by the Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., President of Queen's College, Cambridge, Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Hon. Chaplain to the Queen.

Other Works will be announced later.

The LORD BISHOP OF LONDON has kindly contributed GENERAL INTRODUCTION to the Series.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED.